arXiv:1603.02521v2 [math.RT] 14 Mar 2016

THE UPPER CLUSTER ALGEBRAS OF IART QUIVERS I. DYNKIN

JIARUI FEI

Abstract. For each valued quiver Q of Dynkin type, we construct a valued ice quiver Δ_Q^2 called the iARt quiver of C^2Q. Let G be a simple connected Lie group with Dynkin diagram the underlying valued graph of Q. The upper cluster algebra of Δ_Q^2 is graded by the triple dominant weights (μ, ν, λ) of G. We prove that when G is simply-laced, the dimension of each graded component counts the tensor multiplicity $c_{\mu,\nu}^{\lambda}$. We conjecture that this is also true if G is not simply-laced, and sketch a possible approach. Using this construction, we improve Berenstein-Zelevinsky's model, or in some sense generalize Knutson-Tao's hive model in type A.

Contents

Introduction 2

Part 1. Construction of iARt QPs 6
1. Graded Upper Cluster Algebras 6
2. AR-theory of Presentations 10
3. iARt Quivers 15
4. Cluster Character from Quivers with Potentials 18
5. iARt QPs 20
Appendices 24
A. A List of some iARt Quivers 25

Part 2. Isomorphism to Configuration Spaces 26
6. Cluster Structure of Maximal Unipotent Groups 26
7. A Short Review on the Work of Berenstein-Zelevinsky and Goncharov-Shen 30
8. Maps Relating Unipotent Groups 32
9. Cluster Structure on $k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}]$ 37
10. Epilogue 38
Appendices 40
B. The Twisted Cyclic Shift via Mutations 40
Acknowledgement 46
References 46

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 13F60, 16G20; Secondary 13A50, 52B20.

Key words and phrases. Graded Upper Cluster Algebra, iARt Quiver, Quiver Representation, Quiver with Potential, Mutation, Cluster Character, Configuration Space, Tensor Multiplicity, Littlewood-Richardson Coefficient, g-vector Cone, Lattice Point.

Introduction

Finding the polyhedral model for the tensor multiplicities in Lie theory is a long-standing problem. By *tensor multiplicities* we mean the multiplicities in the tensor product of any two finite-dimensional irreducible representations of a simple connected Lie group G. The problem asks to express the multiplicity as the number of lattice points in some convex polytope.

Accumulating from the works of Gelfand, Berenstein and Zelevinsky since 1970's, a first quite satisfying model for G of type A was invented in [5]. Finally around 1999, building upon their work, Knutson and Tao invented their *hive model*, which led to the solution of the *saturation conjecture* [32]. In fact, the reduction of Horn's problem to the Saturation conjecture is an important driving force for the evolution of the models.

Outside type A, up to now Berenstein and Zelevinsky's models [6] are still the only known polyhedral models. Those models lose a few nice features of Knutson-Tao's hive model. We will have a short discussion on this in Section 0.1. Despite of a lot of effort to improve the Berenstein-Zelevinsky model, to author's best knowledge there is no very satisfying further results in this direction.

Recently an interesting link between the hive model and the *cluster algebra* theory was established in [14] through the Derksen-Weyman-Zelevinsky's *quiver with potential* model [12, 13] for cluster algebras. A similar but different link between the polyhedral models and tropical geometry was established by Goncharov and Shen in [27]. In fact, from the work of Berenstein, Fomin and Zelevinsky [6, 7], those links may not be a big surprise. We will make a brief comparison among these works in Section 0.2.

There are two goals in the current paper. First we want to generalize the work [14] to other types. More specifically, we hope to prove that coordinate rings of certain configuration spaces are all upper cluster algebras. Second we want to improve the Berenstein-Zelevinsky's model in the spirit of Knutson-Tao. In fact, as we shall see, we accomplish these two goals almost simultaneously. Namely, we use our conjectural models to establish the cluster algebra structures. Once the cluster structures are established, the conjectural models are proved as well.

The key to making conjectural models is the construction of the *iARt quivers*, which justifies our title. Let Q be a valued quiver of Dynkin type. Let C^2Q be the category of projective presentations of Q. We can associate this category an *Auslander-Reiten quiver* $\Delta(C^2Q)$ with translation (ARt quiver in short). The iARt quiver Δ^2_Q is obtained from $\Delta(C^2Q)$ by freezing three sets of vertices, which correspond to the *negative*, *positive*, and *neutral* presentations in C^2Q. We can put a (quite canonical) *potential* W^2_Q on the iARt quiver Δ^2_Q.

A quiver with potential (or QP in short) (Δ, W) is related to Berenstein-Fomin-Zelevinsky's *upper cluster algebras* [7] through *cluster characters* evaluating on μ-*supported* g-*vectors* introduced in [14]. The cluster character C_W considered in this paper is the *generic* one [37], but it can be replaced by fancier ones. As we have seen in many different situations [14, 15, 16] that the set $G(\Delta, W)$ of μ-supported g-vectors is given by lattice points in some rational polyhedral cone. This is also the case for the iARt QPs (Δ^2_Q, W^2_Q).

The whole Part 1 is devoted to the construction of the iARt QP (Δ^2_Q, W^2_Q) and the polyhedral cone $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta^2_Q}$. It turns out that the cone $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta^2_Q}$ has a very neat

hyperplane presentation $\{x \in \mathbb{R}^{(\Delta_Q^2)_0} \mid xH \geq 0\}$, where the columns of the matrix H are given by the dimension vectors of subrepresentations of $3|Q_0|$ representations of Δ_Q^2. These $3|Q_0|$ representations are in bijection with the frozen vertices of Δ_Q^2. They also have a very simple and nice description (see Theorem 5.4). The main result of Part 1 is the following.

Theorem 0.1 (Theorem 5.9)**.** *The set* $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{(\Delta_Q^2)_0}$ *is exactly* $G(\Delta_Q^2, W_Q^2)$.

The upper cluster algebra $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_Q^2)$ has a natural grading by the *weight vectors* of presentations. This grading can be extended to a triple-weight grading $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^2 : \mathbb{Z}^{(\Delta_Q^2)_0} \to \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}^{3|Q_0|}$. This grading slices the cone $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2}$ into polytopes

$$\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2}(\mu, \nu, \lambda) := \left\{ \mathsf{g} \in \mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2} \mid \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^2(\mathsf{g}) = (\mu, \nu, \lambda) \right\}.$$

Let $G := G_Q$ be a simple connected Lie group with Dynkin diagram the underlying valued graph of Q. Our conjectural model is that the lattice points in $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2}(\mu, \nu, \lambda)$ counts the tensor multiplicity $c_{\mu\,\nu}^{\lambda}$ for G. Here, $c_{\mu\,\nu}^{\lambda}$ is the multiplicity of the irreducible representation $L(\lambda)$ of highest weight λ in the tensor product $L(\mu) \otimes L(\nu)$. More often than not we identify a dominant weight by a non-negative integral vector. To prove this model, we follow a similar line as [14]. However, we do not have a quiver setting to work with in general. We replace the semi-invariant rings of triple-flag quiver representations by the coordinate ring of certain configuration space introduced in [17].

Fix an opposite pair of maximal unipotent subgroups (U^-, U) of G. The quotient space $\mathcal{A} := U^- \backslash G$ is called *base affine space*, and the quotient space $\mathcal{A}^\vee := G/U$ is called its *dual*. The configuration space $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$ is by definition $(\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}^\vee)/G$, where G acts multi-diagonally. The coordinate ring $k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}]$ is just the invariant ring $(k[G]^{U^-} \otimes k[G]^{U^-} \otimes k[G]^U)^G$. The ring $k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}]$ is multigraded by a triple of weights (μ, ν, λ). Each graded component $C_{\mu,\nu}^{\lambda} := k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}]_{\mu,\nu,\lambda}$ is given by the G-invariant space $\left(L(\mu) \otimes L(\nu) \otimes L(\lambda)^\vee\right)^G$. So the dimension of $C_{\mu,\nu}^{\lambda}$ counts the tensor multiplicity $c_{\mu\,\nu}^{\lambda}$. Here is the main result of Part 2.

Theorem 0.2 (Theorem 9.1)**.** *Suppose that Q is trivially valued. Then the coordinate ring of* $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$ *is the graded upper cluster algebra* $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_Q^2, \mathcal{S}_Q^2; \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^2)$*. Moreover, the generic character maps the lattice points in* $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2}$ *onto a basis of* $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_Q^2)$*. In particular,* $c_{\mu\,\nu}^{\lambda}$ *is counted by lattice points in* $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2}(\mu, \nu, \lambda)$.

We will show by an example that the upper cluster algebra strictly contains the corresponding cluster algebra in general. We conjecture that the trivially valued assumption can be dropped in the above theorem and the theorem below. It is pointed in the end that the only missing ingredient for proving the conjecture is the analogue of [13, Lemma 5.2] for *species with potentials* [34].

Fock and Goncharov studied in [17] the similar spaces $\mathrm{Conf}_3 := (\mathcal{A}^\vee)^3/G$ as cluster varieties. However, to author's best knowledge it is not clear from their discussion what the *seed* is if G is not of type A. Moreover the equality established in the theorem does not seem to fellow from any result there. In fact, Fock and Goncharov later conjectured in [18] that the tropical points in their cluster $\mathcal{X}$-varieties parametrize bases in the corresponding (upper) cluster algebras. Our

result can be viewed as an algebraic analog of their conjecture for the space $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$. Instead of working with the tropical points, we work with the g-vectors.

To sketch our ideas, we first observe that if we forget the frozen vertices corresponding to the positive and neutral presentations, then we get a valued ice quiver denoted by Δ_Q whose cluster algebra is isomorphic to the coordinate ring $k[U]$. Roughly speaking, this procedure corresponds to an open embedding $i : H \times H \times U \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$, or more precisely Corollary 8.8. We will define the cluster $\mathcal{S}_Q^2$ in Theorem 0.2 through the pullback map i^*. It is then not hard to show that $k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}]$ contains the upper cluster algebra $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_Q^2, \mathcal{S}_Q^2; \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^2)$ as a graded subalgebra. The detail will be given in Section 8.1.

So far we have the graded inclusions $C_W(\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2}) \subseteq \overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_Q^2, \mathcal{S}_Q^2; \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^2) \subseteq k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}]$. To finish the proof, it suffices to show the containment $k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}] \subseteq C_W(\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2})$. For this, we come back to the cluster structure of $k[U]$. It turns out that the analog of Theorem 0.2 for U is rather easy to prove. The set $G(\Delta_Q, W_Q)$ contains exactly lattice points in the polytope G_{Δ_Q}, which is defined by one of the three sets of relations of $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2}$. On the other hand, we have two other embeddings $i_l,\ i_r : U \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$. They are the map $i_u := i|_U$ followed by the *twisted cyclic shift* of $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$. Another crucial ingredient in this paper is an interpretation of the twisted cyclic shift in terms of a sequence of mutations $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l$. Applying $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l^{-1}$ to the QP (Δ_Q, W_Q), we get two other QPs (Δ_Q^l, W_Q^l) and (Δ_Q^r, W_Q^r). The analogous polytopes $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^l}$ and $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^r}$ for them are defined by the other two sets of relations of $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2}$. Finally, after showing the well behavior of g-vectors under the pullback of three embeddings, the required inclusion will follow from the fact that

$$k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}] \subseteq \left\{ s \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}_Q^2) \mid i_\#^*(s) \in k[U] \text{ for } \# = u, l, r \right\}, \tag{0.1}$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}_Q^2)$ is the Laurent polynomial ring in the cluster $\mathcal{S}_Q^2$. The detail will be given in Section 8.2.

Except for these two main results, we have a side result for the base affine spaces. The author would like to thank B. Leclerc and M. Yakimov for confirming that the following theorem was an open problem. It turns out that the cluster structure of $\mathcal{A}$ lies between that of U and $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$. Let $\Delta_Q^\sharp$ be the valued ice quiver obtained from Δ_Q^2 by deleting frozen vertices corresponding to neutral presentations.

Theorem 0.3 (Theorem 10.2)**.** *Suppose that Q is trivially valued. Then the coordinate ring of $\mathcal{A}$ is the graded upper cluster algebra $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_Q^\sharp, \mathcal{M}_Q^\sharp; \varpi(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^\sharp))$. Moreover, the generic character maps the lattice points in $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^\sharp}$ onto a basis of $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_Q^\sharp)$. In particular, the weight multiplicity $\dim L(\mu)_\lambda$ is counted by lattice points in $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^\sharp}(\mu, \lambda)$.*

0.1. **The Models.** In [32] Knutson and Tao invented a remarkable polyhedral model called hives or honeycomb. The author personally thinks that it has at least three advantages over Berenstein-Zelevinsky's model [6]. First, the hive polytopes have a nice presentation $\left\{ x \in \mathbb{R}^{3n} \mid xH \geq 0,\ x\boldsymbol{\sigma} = (\mu, \nu, \lambda) \right\}$. Second, the cyclic symmetry of the type-A tensor multiplicity is lucid from the hive model. Actually other symmetries can also follow from the hive model. Last and most importantly, there is an operation called *overlaying* for honeycombs [32].

In appropriate sense, our models share these nice properties. The first one is clear from our result. Our H-matrices even have all non-negative entries. However, if readers prefer the rhombus-type inequalities of the hives, one can transform

our model through a totally unimodular map as in [14]. However, the rhombus-type inequalities are not always as neat as the ones in type A. We will discuss the transformation and the analogous overlaying elsewhere. Although the cyclic symmetry is not immediate clear from H itself, we understand from our construction and proofs that it is just hidden there. We believe that this is probably the best we can do outside type A.

In a more general context of Kac-Moody algebras, the tensor multiplicity problem can be solved by P. Littelmann's path model [35]. As pointed out in [6], his model can be transformed into polyhedral ones (with some non-trivial work). However, in general it involves a union of several convex polytopes.

0.2. **Relation to the work of Berenstein-Zelevinsky and Goncharov-Shen.** In a groundbreaking work [6] Berenstein and Zelevinsky invented their polyhedral model for all Dynkin types. Their main tools are Lusztig's canonical basis and tropical relations in double Bruhat cells. The polytopes are defined explicitly in terms of their $\mathbf{i}$-*trails*. But the author feels that $\mathbf{i}$-trails are hard to compute especially in type E. By contrast, the subrepresentations defining our H are rather easy to list in most cases. In few difficult cases, such as type E_7 and E_8, we provide an algorithm suitable for computers.

Recently Goncharov and Shen made some further progress in [27]. Using tropical geometry and geometric Satake, they proved a more symmetric polyhedral model (see Theorem 7.3). However, there is no further *explicit* description on the polytopes. The equality of (0.1) as an intermediate byproduct of our proof is similar to this result.

Loosely speaking, our work is independent of their results. However, the author did benefit a lot from reading their papers. So we create an independent short section to review their works. The construction of iARt quivers Δ_Q^2 is new. We believe that the construction and results, especially the ideas behind, are beyond just solving the tensor multiplicity problem for simple Lie groups. The proofs in Part 1 are similar to those in [14]. In Part 2 what we heavily rely on is the cluster structure of $k[U]$ and a mutation interpretation of the twisted cyclic shift. Throughout the quiver with potential model for cluster algebras is most important.

Outline of the Paper. In Section 1.1 we recall the basics on valued quivers and their representations. We define the graded upper cluster algebra attached to a valued quiver in Section 1.2 and 1.3. In Section 2.1 we recall the Auslander-Reiten theory from a functorial point of view. We specialize the theory to the category of presentations mostly for hereditary algebras in Section 2.2. In Section 3.1 we define the iARt quivers in general. We then consider the hereditary cases in more detail in Section 3.2. Proposition 3.6 compares the ARt quivers of presentations with the more familiar ARt quivers of representations. In Section 4 we review the generic cluster character in the setting of quivers of potentials. In Section 5 we study the iARt QPs and their μ-supported g-vectors. We prove the two main results of Part 1 – Theorem 5.4 and 5.9. In Appendix A, we provide more examples of iARt quivers.

In Section 6 we review the coordinate rings of base affine spaces and maximal unipotent groups, especially the cluster structure of the latter (Theorem 6.5 and Proposition 6.6). In Section 7 we review the works of Berenstein-Zelevinsky and Goncharov-Shen. In Section 8 we study maps relating the configuration spaces to the corresponding unipotent groups. These are almost all the technical work

required for proving the main result. In Section 9 we prove our main result – Theorem 9.1. In Section 10 we prove the side result – Theorem 10.2. In the end we make some remark on the possible generalization to the non-simply laced cases. In Appendix B we prove the mutation interpretation of the twisted cyclic shift in Theorem B.14. As a consequence, we make an algorithm for computing the (μ-supported) g-vector cones.

Notations and Conventions. Our vectors are exclusively row vectors. All modules are right modules. Arrows are composed from left to right, i.e., ab is the path $\cdot \xrightarrow{a} \cdot \xrightarrow{b} \cdot$. Unless otherwise stated, unadorned Hom and $\otimes$ are all over the base field k, and the superscript $*$ is the trivial dual for vector spaces. For direct sum of n copies of M, we write nM instead of the traditional $M^{\oplus n}$.

Part 1. Construction of iARt QPs

1. Graded Upper Cluster Algebras

1.1. **Valued Quivers and their Representations.** If you are familiar with the usual quiver representations and only care about our results on the simply laced cases, you can skip this subsection. Readers may find more detailed treatment on valued quivers in [9].

Definition 1.1. A valued quiver is a triple $Q = (Q_0, Q_1, C)$ where

(1) Q_0 is a set of vertices, usually labelled by natural numbers $1, 2, \ldots, n$;
(2) Q_1 is a set of arrows, which is a subset of $Q_0 \times Q_0$;
(3) $C = \{(c_{i,j}, c_{j,i}) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \mid (i,j) \in Q_1\}$ is called the *valuation* of Q.

It is called *symmetrizable* if there is $d = \{d_i \in \mathbb{N} \mid i \in Q_0\}$ such that $d_i c_{i,j} = c_{j,i} d_j$ for every $(i,j) \in Q_1$.

For such a valued quiver, the pair (Q_0, Q_1) is called its *ordinary* quiver. Throughout this paper, all valued quivers are assumed to have no loops or oriented 2-cycles in their ordinary quivers. If $c_{i,j} = c_{j,i}$ for every $(c_{i,j}, c_{j,i}) \in C$, then Q is called *equally valued*. To draw a valued quiver (Q_0, Q_1, C), we first draw its ordinary quiver, then put valuations above its arrows, eg., $i \xrightarrow{(c_{i,j}, c_{j,i})} j$. We will omit the valuation if (i,j) is trivially valued, i.e., $c_{i,j} = c_{j,i} = 1$. All valued quivers in this paper will be symmetrizable. We always fix a choice of d, so readers may view d as a part of the defining data for Q. We let $d_{i,j} = \gcd(d_i, d_j)$.

Let $\mathbb{F}$ be a finite field. We write $\overline{\mathbb{F}}$ for an algebraic closure of $\mathbb{F}$. For each positive integer k denote by $\mathbb{F}_k$ the degree k extension of $\mathbb{F}$ in $\overline{\mathbb{F}}$. Note that the largest subfield of $\overline{\mathbb{F}}$ contained in both $\mathbb{F}_k$ and $\mathbb{F}_l$ is $\mathbb{F}_{\gcd(k,l)} = \mathbb{F}_k \cap \mathbb{F}_l$. If $k \mid l$ we can fix a basis of $\mathbb{F}_l$ over $\mathbb{F}_k$ and thus freely identify $\mathbb{F}_l$ as a vector space over $\mathbb{F}_k$.

A representation M of Q is an assignment for each $i \in Q_0$ a $\mathbb{F}_{d_i}$-vector space $M(i)$, and for each arrow $(i,j) \in Q_1$ an $\mathbb{F}_{d_{i,j}}$-linear map $M(i,j)$. The dimension vector $\underline{\dim} M$ is the integer vector $(\dim_{\mathbb{F}_{d_i}} M(i))_{i \in Q_0}$. Similar to the usual quiver representations, we can define a morphism $\phi : M \to N$ as the set

$$\left\{\phi_i \in \mathrm{Hom}_{\mathbb{F}_{d_i}}(M(i), N(i))\right\}_{i \in Q_0} \text{ such that } \phi_j M(i,j) = N(i,j)\phi_i \text{ for all } (i,j) \in Q_1.$$

The category $\mathrm{Rep}(Q)$ of all (finite-dimensional) representations of Q is an abelian category, in which the kernels and cokernels are taken vertex-wise. The category

$\mathrm{Rep}(Q)$ is also *Krull-Schmidt*, that is every representation can be written uniquely as a direct sum of indecomposable representations.

Just as with usual quivers it is useful to consider an equivalent category of modules over the path algebra. Such an analog for valued quivers is the notion of $\mathbb{F}$-species. Define $\Gamma_0 = \prod_{i\in Q_0} \mathbb{F}_{d_i}$ and $\Gamma_1 = \bigoplus_{(i,j)\in Q_1} \mathbb{F}_{d_i c_{i,j}}$. Notice that $\mathbb{F}_{d_i c_{i,j}}$ contains both $\mathbb{F}_{d_i}$ and $\mathbb{F}_{d_j}$ and thus we have a Γ_0-Γ_0-bimodule structure on Γ_1. Now we define the $\mathbb{F}$-species Γ_Q to be the tensor algebra $T_{\Gamma_0}(\Gamma_1)$ of Γ_1 over Γ_0. If Γ_Q is finite-dimensional, then it is clear that the indecomposable projective (resp. injective) modules are precisely $P_i = e_i\Gamma_Q$ (resp. $I_i = \Gamma_Q e_i$) for $i \in Q_0$, where e_i is the identity element in $\mathbb{F}_{d_i}$. The category $\mathrm{Rep}(Q)$ has enough projective and injective objects. The top of P_i is the simple representation S_i supported on the vertex i, which is also the socle of I_i.

The algebra Γ_Q is *hereditary*, that is, it has global dimension 1. So for $M, N \in \mathrm{Rep}(Q)$,

$$\langle M, N\rangle = \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mathrm{Hom}_Q(M,N) - \dim_{\mathbb{F}} \mathrm{Ext}^1_Q(M,N)$$

is a bilinear form only depending on the dimension vectors of M and N. This is called "Ringel-Euler" form, and we denote the matrix of this form by $E(Q)$. We also define the matrix $E_l(Q) := (e^l_{j,i})$ and $E_r(Q) := (e^r_{i,j})$ by

$$e^l_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1 & i = j; \\ -c_{j,i} & (i,j) \in Q_1, \end{cases} \qquad e^r_{i,j} = \begin{cases} 1 & i = j; \\ -c_{i,j} & (i,j) \in Q_1. \end{cases}$$

These matrices are related by $E(Q) = E_l(Q)D = DE_r(Q)$, where D is the diagonal matrix with diagonal entries $d_{i,i} = d_i$.

Example 1.2 (G_2)**.** Consider the valued quiver $1 \xrightarrow{3,1} 2$ of type G_2 with $d = (1,3)$. Its module category has six indecomposable objects

- The simple injective $S_1 : \mathbb{F} \to 0$, and its projective cover $P_1 : \mathbb{F} \hookrightarrow \mathbb{F}_3$;
- The simple projective $S_2 : 0 \to \mathbb{F}_3$, and its injective hull $I_2 : \mathbb{F}^3 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{F}_3$;
- The module $M_1 : \mathbb{F}^2 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{F}_3$, which is presented by $P_2 \hookrightarrow 2P_1$;
- The module $M_2 : \mathbb{F}^3 \hookrightarrow \mathbb{F}_3^2$, which is presented by $P_2 \hookrightarrow 3P_1$.

In this paper, we will encounter two kinds of valued quivers. One is valued quivers Q of Dynkin type, and the other is bigger valued quivers Δ_Q and Δ^2_Q constructed from Q (see Section 3). We will define upper cluster algebras attached to the latter.

1.2. **Upper Cluster Algebras.** We mostly follow [7, 22, 19]. To define the upper cluster algebra, we need to introduce the notion of the quiver mutation. The *mutation* of valued quivers is defined through Fomin-Zelevinsky's mutation of the associated skew-symmetrizable matrix.

Every symmetrizable valued quiver Δ corresponds to a skew symmetrizable integer matrix $B(\Delta) := -E_l(\Delta) + E_r(\Delta)^T$. So the entries $(b_{u,v})_{u,v\in\Delta_0}$ are given by

$$b_{u,v} = \begin{cases} c_{u,v}, & \text{if } (u,v) \in \Delta_1 \\ -c_{u,v}, & \text{if } (v,u) \in \Delta_1 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

The matrix $B(\Delta)$ is *skew symmetrizable* because DB is skew-symmetric for the diagonal matrix D. Conversely, given a skew symmetrizable matrix B, a unique valued quiver Δ can be easily defined such that $B(\Delta) = B$.

Definition 1.3. The *mutation* of a skew symmetrizable matrix B on the direction $u \in \Delta_0$ is given by $\mu_u(B) = (b'_{v,w})$, where

$$b'_{v,w} = \begin{cases} -b_{v,w}, & \text{if } u \in \{v, w\}, \\ b_{v,w} + \operatorname{sign}(b_{v,u}) \max(0, b_{v,u} b_{u,w}), & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We denote the induced operation on its valued quiver also by μ_u.

The cluster algebras that we will consider in this paper are skew-symmetrizable cluster algebras with coefficients. The combinatorial data defining such a cluster algebra is encoded in a symmetrizable valued quiver Δ with *frozen vertices*. Frozen vertices are forbidden to be mutated, and the rest vertices are *mutable*. Such a valued quiver is called valued *ice* quiver (or VIQ in short). The *mutable part* Δ^μ is the full subquiver of Δ consisting of mutable vertices. In general, to define an (upper) cluster algebra only Δ^μ is required to be symmetrizable. However, in this paper all VIQs happen to be "globally" symmetrizable. We usually label the mutable vertices as the first p out of q vertices of Δ. The *restricted* B-matrix B_Δ of Δ is the first p rows of $B(\Delta)$.

Let k be a field, not necessarily related in any sense to the finite field $\mathbb{F}$ or the base field in the rest of Part 1.

Definition 1.4. Let $\mathcal{F}$ be a field containing k. A *seed* in $\mathcal{F}$ is a pair $(\Delta, \mathbf{x})$ consisting of a VIQ Δ as above together with a collection $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_q\}$, called an *extended cluster*, consisting of algebraically independent (over k) elements of $\mathcal{F}$, one for each vertex of Δ. The elements of $\mathbf{x}$ associated with the mutable vertices are called *cluster variables*; they form a *cluster*. The elements associated with the frozen vertices are called *frozen variables*, or *coefficient variables*.

A *seed mutation* μ_u at a (mutable) vertex u transforms $(\Delta, \mathbf{x})$ into the seed $(\Delta', \mathbf{x}') = \mu_u(\Delta, \mathbf{x})$ defined as follows. The new VIQ is $\Delta' = \mu_u(\Delta)$. The new extended cluster is $\mathbf{x}' = \mathbf{x} \cup \{x'_u\} \setminus \{x_u\}$ where the new cluster variable x'_u replacing x_u is determined by the *exchange relation*

$$x_u x'_u = \prod_{(v,u) \in \Delta_1} x_v^{c_{v,u}} + \prod_{(u,w) \in \Delta_1} x_w^{c_{u,w}}. \tag{1.1}$$

We note that the mutated seed $(\Delta', \mathbf{x}')$ contains the same coefficient variables as the original seed $(\Delta, \mathbf{x})$. It is easy to check that one can recover $(\Delta, \mathbf{x})$ from $(\Delta', \mathbf{x}')$ by performing a seed mutation again at u. Two seeds $(\Delta, \mathbf{x})$ and $(\Delta', \mathbf{x}')$ that can be obtained from each other by a sequence of mutations are called *mutation-equivalent*, denoted by $(\Delta, \mathbf{x}) \sim (\Delta', \mathbf{x}')$.

Definition 1.5. The *cluster algebra* $\mathcal{C}(\Delta, \mathbf{x})$ associated to a seed $(\Delta, \mathbf{x})$ is defined as the subring of $\mathcal{F}$ generated by all elements of all extended clusters of the seeds mutation-equivalent to $(\Delta, \mathbf{x})$.

Note that the above construction of $\mathcal{C}(\Delta, \mathbf{x})$ depends only, up to a natural isomorphism, on the mutation equivalence class of the initial VIQ Δ. In fact, it only depends on the mutation equivalence class of the restricted B-matrix of Δ. So we may drop $\mathbf{x}$ and simply write $\mathcal{C}(\Delta)$ or $\mathcal{C}(B_\Delta)$.

An amazing property of cluster algebras is the *Laurent Phenomenon*.

Theorem 1.6 ([21, 7])**.** *Any element of a cluster algebra $\mathcal{C}(\Delta, \mathbf{x})$ can be expressed in terms of the extended cluster $\mathbf{x}$ as a Laurent polynomial, which is polynomial in coefficient variables.*

Since $\mathcal{C}(\Delta, \mathbf{x})$ is generated by cluster variables from the seeds mutation equivalent to $(\Delta, \mathbf{x})$, Theorem 1.6 can be rephrased as

$$\mathcal{C}(\Delta, \mathbf{x}) \subseteq \bigcap_{(\Delta', \mathbf{x}') \sim (\Delta, \mathbf{x})} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{x}'},$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{x}} := k[x_1^{\pm 1}, \ldots, x_p^{\pm 1}, x_{p+1}, \ldots x_q]$. Note that our definition of $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is slightly different from the original one in [7], where $\mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{x}}$ is replaced by the Laurent polynomial $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x}) := k[x_1^{\pm 1}, \ldots, x_p^{\pm 1}, x_{p+1}^{\pm 1}, \ldots x_q^{\pm 1}]$.

Definition 1.7. The *upper cluster algebra* with seed $(\Delta, \mathbf{x})$ is

$$\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta, \mathbf{x}) := \bigcap_{(\Delta', \mathbf{x}') \sim (\Delta, \mathbf{x})} \mathcal{L}_{\mathbf{x}'}.$$

Any (upper) cluster algebra, being a subring of a field, is an integral domain (and under our conventions, a k-algebra). Conversely, given such a domain R, one may be interested in identifying R as an (upper) cluster algebra. The following useful lemma is a specialization of [19, Proposition 3.6] to the case when R is a unique factorization domain.

Lemma 1.8. *Let R be a finitely generated UFD over k. Suppose that $(\Delta, \mathbf{x})$ is a seed contained in R, and each adjacent cluster variable x'_u is also in R. Moreover, each pair in $\mathbf{x}$ and each pair (x_u, x'_u) are relatively prime. Then $R \supseteq \overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta, \mathbf{x})$.*

1.3. **g-vectors and Gradings.** Let $\mathbf{x} = \{x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_q\}$ be an (extended) cluster. For a vector $\mathtt{g} \in \mathbb{Z}^q$, we write $\mathbf{x}^{\mathtt{g}}$ for the monomial $x_1^{\mathtt{g}(1)} x_2^{\mathtt{g}(2)} \cdots x_q^{\mathtt{g}(q)}$. For $u = 1, 2, \ldots, p$, we set $y_u = \mathbf{x}^{-b_u}$ where b_u is the u-th row of the matrix B_Δ, and let $\mathbf{y} = \{y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_p\}$.

Suppose that an element $z \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})$ can be written as

$$z = \mathbf{x}^{\mathtt{g}(z)} F(y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_p), \tag{1.2}$$

where F is a rational polynomial not divisible by any y_i, and $\mathtt{g}(z) \in \mathbb{Z}^q$. If we assume that the matrix B_Δ has full rank, then the elements $y_1, y_2, \ldots, y_p$ are algebraically independent so that the vector $\mathtt{g}(z)$ is uniquely determined [22]. We call the vector $\mathtt{g}(z)$ the (extended) $\mathtt{g}$-*vector* of z with respect to the pair $(\Delta, \mathbf{x})$. Definition implies at once that for two such elements z_1, z_2 we have that $\mathtt{g}(z_1 z_2) = \mathtt{g}(z_1) + \mathtt{g}(z_2)$. So the set of all $\mathtt{g}$-vectors in any subalgebra of $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})$ forms a sub-semigroup of $\mathbb{Z}^q$.

Lemma 1.9 ([14, Lemma 5.5], *cf.* [37])**.** *If the matrix B_Δ has full rank, then any subset of $\mathcal{L}(\mathbf{x})$ with distinct well-defined $\mathtt{g}$-vectors is linearly independent over k.*

Definition 1.10. A *weight configuration* $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ of a lattice $\mathbb{L} \subseteq \mathbb{R}^m$ on a VIQ Δ is an assignment for each vertex v of Δ a weight vector $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(v) \in \mathbb{L}$ such that for each mutable vertex u, we have that

$$\sum_{(v,u) \in \Delta_1} c_{v,u} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(v) = \sum_{(u,w) \in \Delta_1} c_{u,w} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(w). \tag{1.3}$$

The *mutation* μ_u also transforms $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ into a weight configuration $\boldsymbol{\sigma}'$ on the mutated quiver $\mu_u(\Delta)$ defined as

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}'(v) = \begin{cases} \displaystyle\sum_{(u,w) \in \Delta_1} c_{u,w} \boldsymbol{\sigma}(w) - \boldsymbol{\sigma}(u) & \text{if } v = u, \\ \boldsymbol{\sigma}(v) & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

By slight abuse of notation, we can view $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ as a matrix whose v-th row is the weight vector $\boldsymbol{\sigma}(v)$. In this matrix notation, the condition (1.3) is equivalent to that $B_\Delta \boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is a zero matrix. So we call the cokernel of B_Δ as the *grading space* of $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta)$. A weight configuration $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ is called *full* if the corank of B_Δ is equal to the rank of $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$. It is easy to see that for any weight configuration of Δ, the mutation can be iterated.

Given a weight configuration $(\Delta; \boldsymbol{\sigma})$, we can assign a multidegree (or weight) to the upper cluster algebra $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta, \mathbf{x})$ by setting $\deg(x_v) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}(v)$ for $v = 1, 2, \ldots, q$. Then mutation preserves multihomogeneousity. We say that this upper cluster algebra is $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$-graded, and denoted by $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta, \mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\sigma})$. We refer to $(\Delta, \mathbf{x}; \boldsymbol{\sigma})$ as a graded seed. Note that the variables in $\mathbf{y}$ have zero degrees. So if z has a well-defined g-vector as in (1.2), then z is homogeneous of degree $\mathsf{g}\boldsymbol{\sigma}$.

2. AR-theory of Presentations

2.1. **Review of categories of functors and AR-theory.** We briefly review Auslander-Reiten theory emphasizing a functorial point of view following [3, IV.6]. The theory were developed originally for module categories of Artin algebras, but without much difficulty almost all can be generalized to k-linear, Hom-finite, and Krull-Schmidt categories.

Let k be a field, and $\mathcal{A}$ be a k-linear, Hom-finite, and Krull-Schmidt category. For any two objects $M, N \in \mathcal{A}$, let $\operatorname{rad}_{\mathcal{A}}(M, N)$ be the space of all non-invertible morphisms from M to N. We define $\operatorname{rad}^2_{\mathcal{A}}(M, N)$ to consist of all morphisms of form gf, where $f \in \operatorname{rad}_{\mathcal{A}}(M, L)$ and $g \in \operatorname{rad}_{\mathcal{A}}(L, N)$ for some $L \in \mathcal{A}$. We denote

$$\operatorname{Irr}_{\mathcal{A}}(M, N) := \operatorname{rad}_{\mathcal{A}}(M, N)/\operatorname{rad}^2_{\mathcal{A}}(M, N).$$

If M is indecomposable, then $\operatorname{End}_{\mathcal{A}}(M)$ is local, and thus $\operatorname{Aut}_{\mathcal{A}}(M)$ is a division k-algebra. Let $\operatorname{ind}(\mathcal{A})$ be the full subcategory of all indecomposable objects in $\mathcal{A}$.

Definition 2.1. For $M, N \in \operatorname{ind}(\mathcal{A})$, an *irreducible morphism* $f : M \to N$ is an element in $\operatorname{Irr}_{\mathcal{A}}(M, N)$.

Let $M = \bigoplus_{i=1}^{t} m_i M_i$ be an object in $\mathcal{A}$ with M_i indecomposable and pairwise non-isomorphic. For $f \in \operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(L, M)$ with L indecomposable, we can write f as $f = (f_1, \ldots, f_t)$ where $f_i = (f_{i,1}, \ldots, f_{i,m_i}) : L \to m_i M_i$. Then f is called *left minimal almost split* if the residual classes of $f_{i,j}$'s in $\operatorname{Irr}_{\mathcal{A}}(L, M_i)$ form a $\operatorname{Aut}_{\mathcal{A}}(L)$-basis for all i, and if there is an indecomposable $M' \in \mathcal{A}$ such that $\operatorname{Irr}_{\mathcal{A}}(L, M') \neq 0$, then $M' \cong M_i$ for some i. Similarly we can define *right minimal almost split* for $g : M \to N$.

An exact sequence $0 \to L \to M \to N \to 0$ in $\mathcal{A}$ is called *almost split* if $L \to M$ is left minimal almost split, and $M \to N$ is right minimal almost split. In this case, L is called the *translation* of N, denoted by τN.

The definition for left (right) minimal almost split is not the original one (see [3, Definition IV.1.1]), but it follows from [3, Proposition IV.4.2]. We also recall a basic fact [2] that

$$\dim_{\operatorname{Aut}_{\mathcal{A}}(M_i)} \operatorname{Irr}_{\mathcal{A}}(M_i, N) = \dim_{\operatorname{Aut}_{\mathcal{A}}(M_i)^{\mathrm{op}}} \operatorname{Irr}_{\mathcal{A}}(L, M_i). \tag{2.1}$$

Let A be a finite dimensional k-algebra, and $\operatorname{mod} A$ be the category of finite dimensional (right) A-modules.

Proposition 2.2 ([2, Theorem V.1.15])**.** *The translation τ is defined for every indecomposable non-projective A-module. It is given by the trivial dual of* Auslander's transpose functor *(see* [2, IV.1]*).*

We denote by $\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}}$ the opposite category of $\mathcal{A}$, and by $\operatorname{mod}\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}}$ the category of k-linear, additive, contravariant functors from $\mathcal{A}$ to $\operatorname{mod}k$. For an object M of $\mathcal{A}$, the functor $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-,M)$ is an object of $\operatorname{mod}\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}}$. From the Yondeda embedding

$$\operatorname{Hom}_{\operatorname{mod}\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}}}(\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-,M),F)\cong F(M)\quad \forall F\in\operatorname{mod}\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}},$$

we can conclude [3, Corollary IV.6.4] that $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(-,M)$ is a projective object in $\operatorname{mod}\mathcal{A}^{\mathrm{op}}$. In fact, every (finitely generated) projective object is of this form ([3, Lemma IV.6.5]). We can ask readers to formulate the dual statements for the injective object $\operatorname{Hom}_{\mathcal{A}}(M,-)^*$. For each object M, we can associate a unique simple functor S_M characterizing by $S_M(M)=k$ and $S_M(N)=0$ for all $N\ncong M$.

Let us come back to the category $\operatorname{mod}A$. We consider the subcategory $\operatorname{proj}\text{-}A$ of all projective A-modules. Through the Yoneda embedding, $\operatorname{mod}(\operatorname{proj}\text{-}A)^{\mathrm{op}}$ is equivalent to $\operatorname{mod}A$.

Lemma 2.3 ([3, Theorem IV.6.11])**.** *Let N be an indecomposable A-module.*

(1) *If N is non-projective, then the exact sequence $0\to L\to M\to N\to 0$ is almost split if and only if the induced sequence of functors*

$$0\to\operatorname{Hom}_A(-,L)\to\operatorname{Hom}_A(-,M)\to\operatorname{Hom}_A(-,N)\to S_N\to 0$$

is a minimal projective resolution of S_N in $\operatorname{mod}(\operatorname{mod}A^{\mathrm{op}})$.

(2) *If N is projective, then $M\to N$ is right minimal almost split if and only if the induced sequence of functors*

$$0\to\operatorname{Hom}_A(-,M)\to\operatorname{Hom}_A(-,N)\to S_N\to 0$$

is a minimal projective resolution of S_N in $\operatorname{mod}(\operatorname{mod}A^{\mathrm{op}})$.

2.2. **Presentations.** Let A be some finite dimensional k-algebra with valued quiver Q (see [2, III.1]). If you do not know what a valued quiver associated to A is, then you can just take A to be the $\mathbb{F}$-species defined in Section 1.1. Let $C^2A:=\operatorname{Ch}_2(\operatorname{proj}\text{-}A)$ be the category of projective presentations. To be more precise, the objects in C^2A are 2-term complexes $P_+\xrightarrow{f}P_-$ in $\operatorname{proj}\text{-}A$ (with P_+ and P_- in some fixed degrees). The morphisms are commutative diagrams. Note that this category is Krull-Schmidt, but not abelian. For any $\beta\in\mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}^{Q_0}$ we denote $\bigoplus_{i\in Q_0}\beta(i)P_i$ by $P(\beta)$. If $P_\pm=P(\beta_\pm)$, then the *weight vector* $(\mathsf{f}_-,\mathsf{f}_+)$ of f is (β_-,β_+). The *reduced weight vector* f is the difference $\mathsf{f}_+-\mathsf{f}_-$.

Presentations of forms $0\to P$, $P\to 0$, and $P\xrightarrow{\mathrm{Id}}P$ are called *negative, positive*, and *neutral*. They are also denoted by O_P^-, O_P^+ and Id_P respectively. If $P=P_i$ is the indecomposable projective module corresponding to $i\in Q_0$, then they are called i-th negative, positive, and neutral presentation, and denoted by O_i^-, O_i^+ and Id_i respectively.

Lemma 2.4. [10] *Any presentation f decomposes as $f=f_+\oplus f_{\mathrm{Id}}\oplus f'$, where f_+ is positive, f_{Id} is neutral, and f' is the minimal presentation of* $\operatorname{Coker}(f)$.

Corollary 2.5. *An indecomposable presentation is one of the following four kinds. They are i-th negative, positive, neutral presentations, and minimal presentations of indecomposable non-projective representations of A.*

The following lemma is easy to verify.

Lemma 2.6. *For any $P_+\xrightarrow{f}P_-\in C^2A$ and $P\in\operatorname{mod}A$, we have*

(1) $\mathrm{Hom}_{C^2A}(\mathrm{O}_P^-, f) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_A(P, P_-)$;
(2) $\mathrm{Hom}_{C^2A}(f, \mathrm{O}_P^+) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_A(P_+, P)$;
(3) $\mathrm{Hom}_{C^2A}(\mathrm{Id}_P, f) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_A(P, P_+)$;
(4) $\mathrm{Hom}_{C^2A}(f, \mathrm{Id}_P) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_A(P_-, P)$.

Let f and g be two presentations of representations M and N, namely, $M = \mathrm{Coker}\, f$ and $N = \mathrm{Coker}\, g$. For any morphism in $\varphi \in \mathrm{Hom}_{C^2A}(f, g)$, we get an induced morphism $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}_A(M, N)$.

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} P_+ & \xrightarrow{f} & P_- & \longrightarrow & M & \longrightarrow & 0 \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varphi_+} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \varphi_-} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle \phi} & & \\ R_+ & \xrightarrow{g} & R_- & \longrightarrow & N & \longrightarrow & 0 \end{array}$$

Conversely, any $\phi \in \mathrm{Hom}_A(M, N)$ lifts to a morphism in $\mathrm{Hom}_{C^2A}(f, g)$. So we obtain a surjection

$$\pi : \mathrm{Hom}_{C^2A}(f, g) \twoheadrightarrow \mathrm{Hom}_A(\mathrm{Coker}\, f, \mathrm{Coker}\, g).$$

π maps to a zero morphism if and only if the image of φ_- is contained in the image of g. In this case, φ_- lifts to a map in $\mathrm{Hom}_A(P_-, R_+)$ because P_- is projective. Hence the kernel of π is the image of the map ι

$$\iota : \mathrm{Hom}_A(P_-, R_+) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{C^2A}(f, g),\ h \mapsto gh - hf.$$

Moreover, if g is injective, ι is injective as well. We record this in terms of functors.

Lemma 2.7. *We have the exact sequence*

$$\mathrm{Hom}_{C^2A}(-, \mathrm{Id}_{R^+}) \to \mathrm{Hom}_{C^2A}(-, g) \to \mathrm{Hom}_A(\mathrm{Coker}\, -, \mathrm{Coker}\, g) \to 0.$$

Moreover, if g is injective, then the leftmost map is injective as well.

From now on let us assume A is the $\mathbb{F}$-species Γ_Q. We denote $C^2\Gamma_Q$ by C^2Q. For a representation M of Q, we write $f(M) : P_+(M) \to P_-(M)$ for its minimal presentation. In the following two lemmas, we write $\mathrm{Hom}(-,-)$ for $\mathrm{Hom}_{C^2Q}(-,-)$. Some of the results below were also proved in [8] in a slightly different setting.

Lemma 2.8. *Suppose that $0 \to L \to M \to N \to 0$ is an almost split sequence in* $\mathrm{Rep}(Q)$. *Then we have the projective resolution of the simple in* $\mathrm{mod}(C^2Q)^{\mathrm{op}}$

$$0 \to \mathrm{Hom}(-, f(L)) \to \mathrm{Hom}(-, f(M)) \to \mathrm{Hom}(-, f(N)) \to S_{f(N)} \to 0 \tag{2.2}$$

unless L is simple. If $L = S_i$, then the resolution becomes

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \to \mathrm{Hom}(-, f(S_i)) \to \mathrm{Hom}(-, f(M)) \oplus \mathrm{Hom}(-, \mathrm{Id}_i) \\ \to \mathrm{Hom}(-, f(N)) \to S_{f(N)} \to 0. \end{aligned} \tag{2.2'}$$

Proof. Suppose that L is not simple. We can splice the minimal presentations of L and N together to form a presentation of M

$$P_+(L) \oplus P_+(N) \xrightarrow{f} P_-(L) \oplus P_-(N) \to M \to 0.$$

By construction, we have the exact sequence $0 \to f(L) \to f \to f(N) \to 0$. We claim that f is minimal. This is equivalent to that $\dim \mathrm{Hom}_Q(M, S_i) = \dim \mathrm{Hom}_Q(L, S_i) + \dim \mathrm{Hom}_Q(N, S_i)$ and $\dim \mathrm{Ext}^1_Q(M, S_i) = \dim \mathrm{Ext}^1_Q(L, S_i) +$

$\dim \operatorname{Ext}^1_Q(N, S_i)$ for each S_i. Since $0 \to L \to M \to N \to 0$ is almost split and L is non-simple, it follows that

$$0 \to \operatorname{Hom}_Q(N, S_i) \to \operatorname{Hom}_Q(M, S_i) \to \operatorname{Hom}_Q(L, S_i) \to 0,$$

$$0 \to \operatorname{Ext}^1_Q(N, S_i) \to \operatorname{Ext}^1_Q(M, S_i) \to \operatorname{Ext}^1_Q(L, S_i) \to 0$$

are both exact.

Using Lemma 2.7, we expand (2.2) to a double complex with exact columns, in which (2.2) sits as the middle row. The bottom row is

$$0 \to \operatorname{Hom}_Q(\operatorname{Coker} -, L) \to \operatorname{Hom}_Q(\operatorname{Coker} -, M) \to \operatorname{Hom}_Q(\operatorname{Coker} -, N) \to S_N \to 0,$$

which is exact by Lemma 2.3. The top row is

$$0 \to \operatorname{Hom}(-, \operatorname{Id}_{P_+(L)}) \to \operatorname{Hom}(-, \operatorname{Id}_{P_+(L)\oplus P_+(N)}) \to \operatorname{Hom}(-, \operatorname{Id}_{P_+(N)}) \to 0,$$

which is clearly exact. It is easy to see that (2.2) holds when evaluating on $f(N)$. When evaluating outside $f(N)$, the exactness of (2.2) follows from the 3×3 lemma.

In the case when $L = S_i$, by Auslander-Reiten formula [3, Theorem IV.2.13]

$$\operatorname{Hom}_Q(\tau^{-1}L, S_i) = \operatorname{Ext}^1_Q(S_i, S_i)^* = 0, \quad \operatorname{Ext}^1_Q(\tau^{-1}L, S_i) = \operatorname{Hom}_Q(S_i, S_i)^* = k.$$

So we have the exact sequence

$$0 \to \operatorname{Hom}_Q(M, S_i) \to \operatorname{Hom}_Q(L, S_i) \cong \operatorname{Ext}^1_Q(\tau^{-1}L, S_i) \to \operatorname{Ext}^1_Q(M, S_i) \to 0.$$

Hence $\operatorname{Hom}_Q(M, S_i) = \operatorname{Ext}^1_Q(M, S_i) = 0$. This implies $0 \to f(L) \to f(M) \oplus \operatorname{Id}_i \to f(N) \to 0$ is exact. The same argument as before shows that (2.2') holds. □

Lemma 2.9. *We have the following projective resolutions of simple objects in* $\operatorname{mod}(C^2Q)^{\mathrm{op}}$

$$(2.3)\quad 0 \to \bigoplus_{(i,j)\in Q_1} c_{j,i} \operatorname{Hom}(-, \mathrm{O}_j^-) \to \operatorname{Hom}(-, \mathrm{O}_i^-) \to S_{\mathrm{O}_i^-} \to 0;$$

$$(2.4)\quad 0 \to \operatorname{Hom}(-, f(I_i)) \to \bigoplus_{(k,i)\in Q_1} c_{i,k} \operatorname{Hom}(-, f(I_k)) \oplus \bigoplus_{(i,j)\in Q_1} c_{j,i} \operatorname{Hom}(-, \mathrm{O}_j^+)$$
$$\to \operatorname{Hom}(-, \mathrm{O}_i^+) \to S_{\mathrm{O}_i^+} \to 0 \qquad \textit{if } i \textit{ is not a source};$$

$$(2.4')\quad 0 \to \operatorname{Hom}(-, f(I_i)) \to \bigoplus_{(k,i)\in Q_1} c_{i,k} \operatorname{Hom}(-, f(I_k)) \oplus \bigoplus_{(i,j)\in Q_1} c_{j,i} \operatorname{Hom}(-, \mathrm{O}_j^+)$$
$$\oplus \operatorname{Hom}(-, \operatorname{Id}_i) \to \operatorname{Hom}(-, \mathrm{O}_i^+) \to S_{\mathrm{O}_i^+} \to 0 \qquad \textit{if } i \textit{ is a source};$$

$$(2.5)\quad 0 \to \operatorname{Hom}(-, f(S_i)) \to \operatorname{Hom}(-, \operatorname{Id}_i) \to S_{\operatorname{Id}_i} \to 0.$$

Proof. By Lemma 2.7 $\operatorname{Hom}(f, \mathrm{O}_i^-) \cong \operatorname{Hom}_Q(\operatorname{Coker} f, P_i)$, so the exactness of (2.3) follows from Lemma 2.3.(2). We prove the rest by evaluating these sequences on indecomposable presentations $f : P_- \to P_+$. For (2.5), it is clear for $f = \operatorname{Id}_i$. If $f \neq \operatorname{Id}_i$, it is equivalent to that any morphism $\varphi_- \in \operatorname{Hom}_Q(P_-, P_i)$ uniquely determines a morphism in $\operatorname{Hom}(f, f(S_i))$. Since $f(S_i) : \bigoplus_{(i,j)\in Q_1} c_{j,i} P_j \hookrightarrow P_i$ is right minimal almost split ([3, Proposition IV.3.5]), we have a unique lift $\widetilde{\varphi} \in \operatorname{Hom}_A(P_-, \bigoplus_{(i,j)\in Q_1} c_{j,i} P_j)$. Then the map $(\varphi_+ := \widetilde{\varphi} f, \varphi_-)$ is the unique morphism in $\operatorname{Hom}(f, f(S_i))$.

The proof of resolution (2.4) and (2.4') of $S_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}$ is similar to that of Lemma 2.8. It contains two cases, but we only prove the first one because the second is similar. We

have the exact sequence $0 \to S_i \to I_i \to \bigoplus_{(i,k)\in Q_1} c_{i,k} I_k \to 0$. Similar argument as in Lemma 2.8 shows that

$$0 \to f(S_i) \to f(I_i) \oplus \mathrm{Id}_i \to \bigoplus_{(i,k)\in Q_1} c_{i,k} f(I_k) \to 0$$

is exact if i is not a source (i.e., I_i is not simple). We assume that I_i is minimally presented by $R^i_+ \to R^i_-$, then by construction we have an exact sequence

$$0 \to \bigoplus_{(i,j)\in Q_1} c_{j,i} P_j \to R^i_+ \oplus P_i \to \bigoplus_{(k,i)\in Q_1} c_{i,k} R^k_+ \to 0. \tag{2.6}$$

In particular, we see that $\bigoplus_{(k,i)\in Q_1} c_{i,k} R^k_+$ contains P_i as a direct summand.

It is easy to verify (2.4) for O^+_i, so we assume that $f \neq \mathrm{O}^+_i$, and moreover $f : P_- \to P_+$ presents M. Using Lemma 2.7, we expand (2.4) to a double complex with exact columns.

(2.7)

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc}
 & & 0 & & 0 & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & \mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_-, R^i_+) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{(k,i)\in Q_1} c_{i,k}\,\mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_-, R^k_+) & & \\
 & & & & \oplus \bigoplus_{(i,j)\in Q_1} c_{j,i}\,\mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_+, P_j) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_+, P_i) \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \| \\
0 & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(f, f(I_i)) & \longrightarrow & \bigoplus_{(k,i)\in Q_1} c_{i,k}\,\mathrm{Hom}(f, f(I_k)) & & \\
 & & & & \oplus \bigoplus_{(i,j)\in Q_1} c_{j,i}\,\mathrm{Hom}(f, \mathrm{O}^+_j) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}(f, \mathrm{O}^+_i) \longrightarrow 0 \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & \mathrm{Hom}_Q(M, I_i) & \xrightarrow{l} & \bigoplus_{(k,i)\in Q_1} c_{i,k}\,\mathrm{Hom}_Q(M, I_k) & & \\
 & & \downarrow & & \downarrow & & \\
 & & 0 & & 0 & &
\end{array}$$

Due to (2.6), we write

$$\mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_-, R^i_+) = \mathrm{Hom}_Q\Big(P_-, \Big(\bigoplus_{(k,i)\in Q_1} c_{i,k} R^k_+\Big)\Big/ P_i\Big) \oplus \mathrm{Hom}_Q\Big(P_-, \bigoplus_{(i,j)\in Q_1} c_{j,i} P_j\Big).$$

After reflecting the top row of (2.7) for a while, we find that it is

(2.8)

$$\begin{array}{ccccc}
\mathrm{Hom}_Q\Big(P_-, \big(\bigoplus_{(k,i)\in Q_1} c_{i,k} R^k_+\big)\big/ P_i\Big) & = & \mathrm{Hom}_Q\Big(P_-, \big(\bigoplus_{(k,i)\in Q_1} c_{i,k} R^k_+\big)\big/ P_i\Big) & & \\
\oplus & & & \searrow^{0} & \\
 & & \oplus\, \mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_-, P_i) & \longrightarrow & \mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_+, P_i) \\
\bigoplus_{(i,j)\in Q_1} c_{j,i}\,\mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_-, P_j) & \nearrow & \longrightarrow & \nearrow & \\
 & & \oplus \bigoplus_{(i,j)\in Q_1} c_{j,i}\,\mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_+, P_j) & &
\end{array}$$

So the top row of (2.7) reduces to the last two rows of (2.8). It is nothing but the double complex obtained by taking Hom_Q to the presentations $f(M)$ and $f(S_i)$. We know that this complex has cohomology $0, \mathrm{Hom}_Q(M, S_i)$ and $\mathrm{Ext}^1_Q(M, S_i)$ from

left to right. On the other hand, the map l has kernel and cokernel $\mathrm{Hom}_Q(M, S_i)$ and $\mathrm{Ext}^1_Q(M, S_i)$ as well. Finally, we can easily chase through the diagram and conclude the exactness of the middle row. □

According to the above two lemmas, it makes sense (as least in hereditary cases) to extend the classical Auslander-Reiten translation τ from projective-free representations to the negative-and-neutral-free presentations as in [10]. For $f = f(M)$, we define $\tau f := f(\tau M)$. For each $i \in Q_0$ we define $\tau(\mathrm{O}_i^+) := f(I_i)$.

3. iART Quivers

3.1. **iARt Quivers.** We slightly upgrade the classical Auslander-Reiten quiver by adding the translation arrows. The following definition is basically taken from [2, VII.1]. Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a category as in Section 2.1. Recall that for each $M \in \mathrm{ind}(\mathcal{A})$, $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{A}}(M)$ is a division k-algebra.

Definition 3.1 (ARt quiver)**.** The ARt valued quiver $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$ of $\mathcal{A}$ is defined as follows:

(1) The vertex of $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$ are the isomorphism classes of objects in $\mathrm{ind}\,\mathcal{A}$.
(2) There is a *morphism arrow* $M \to N$ if $\mathrm{Irr}_{\mathcal{A}}(M, N)$ is non-empty. We assign the valuation (a, b) to this arrow, where $a = \dim_{\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{A}}(M)} \mathrm{Irr}_{\mathcal{A}}(M, N)$ and $b = \dim_{\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{A}}(N)^{\mathrm{op}}} \mathrm{Irr}_{\mathcal{A}}(M, N)$.
(3) There is a *translation arrow* from N to τN with trivial valuation if τN is defined.

A vertex u in an ARt quiver is called *transitive* if the translation and its inverse are both defined at u.

Note that the number a in the valuation (a, b) can be alternatively interpreted as the (direct sum) multiplicity of M in E for $E \to N$ minimal right almost split. Similarly b is the multiplicity of N in E' for $M \to E'$ minimal left almost split. Moreover, if $\mathcal{A}$ is *k-elementary*, i.e., $\mathrm{Aut}_{\mathcal{A}}(M) = k$ for any $M \in \mathrm{ind}(\mathcal{A})$, then all morphism arrows are equally valued.

Definition 3.2 (iARt quivers)**.**

- The iARt quiver $\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}$ is obtained from the ARt quiver $\Delta(\mathcal{A})$ by freezing all vertices whose translations are not defined.
- The iARt quiver $\Delta^2_{\mathcal{A}}$ is obtained from the ARt quiver $\Delta(C^2\mathcal{A})$ by freezing all non-transitive vertices.

Remark 3.3. When $\mathcal{A}$ is the module category of a finite-dimensional algebra, the frozen vertices of $\Delta_{\mathcal{A}}$ are precisely indecomposable projective modules. However, it is not clear which vertices are frozen in $\Delta^2_{\mathcal{A}}$. The author think it is an interesting and doable problem to determine the non-transitive vertices. We will see that if the algebra is hereditary, then they are precisely the negative, positive and neutral presentations.

We use the notation

$L \to M$	if there is a morphism arrow from L to M;
$L \dashrightarrow M$	if there is a translation arrow from L to M;
$L \rightarrowtail M$	if there is an arrow from L to M in the ARt quiver.

Lemma 3.4. *Let θ be an additive function from $\mathcal{A}$ to some abelian group, that is, $\theta(L)+\theta(N)=\theta(M)$ for each exact sequence $0\to L\to M\to N\to 0$ in $\mathcal{A}$. Then at each transitive vertex L, we have that $\sum_{M\rightarrowtail L} c_{M,L}\theta(M)=\sum_{L\rightarrowtail N} c_{L,N}\theta(N)$.*

Proof. We have two almost split sequences

$$0\to \tau L\to \bigoplus_{M\to L} c_{M,L}M\to L\to 0,$$
$$0\to L\to \bigoplus_{L\to N} c_{L,N}N\to \tau^{-1}L\to 0.$$

By the additivity of θ, we have that

$$\theta(L)=\sum_{M\to L} c_{M,L}\theta(M)-\theta(\tau L)=\sum_{L\to N} c_{L,N}\theta(N)-\theta(\tau^{-1}L),$$
$$\Rightarrow \quad \sum_{M\rightarrowtail L} c_{M,L}\theta(M)=\sum_{L\rightarrowtail N} c_{L,N}\theta(N).$$

□

A typical additive function in C^2A is the weight vector. In some special cases including examples below, indecomposable presentations are uniquely determined by their weight vectors. So we can label them on an iARt quiver by their weight vectors. We will use the "exponential form" as a shorthand. For example, a vector $(3,1,0,0,-2,0,-1)$ is written as $(5^2 7, 1^3 2)$.

Example 3.5. Let A be the Jacobian algebra of the quiver with potential (Q,W) (see Section 4.1), where $Q=$  and W is the difference of two oriented triangles.



Two vertices with the same weight label $(1,2)$ are identified. The translation arrow going out from $(0,2)$ ends in $(1,0)$.

3.2. **Hereditary Cases.** In particular, if we take $\mathcal{A}:=\mathrm{Rep}(Q)$ for some valued quiver Q, we get two ARt quivers $\Delta(Q):=\Delta(\mathrm{Rep}(Q))$ and $\Delta(C^2Q)$. We denote the corresponding iARt quivers by Δ_Q and Δ_Q^2.

Proposition 3.6. *The ARt quiver $\Delta(C^2Q)$ can be obtained from $\Delta(Q)$ as follows.*

(1) *We add $|Q_0|$ vertices corresponding to O_i^+ and another $|Q_0|$ vertices corresponding to Id_i.*

(2) *For each* $i \xrightarrow{(a,b)} j$ *in* Q*, we draw morphism arrows* $\mathrm{O}_j^+ \xrightarrow{(a,b)} \mathrm{O}_i^+$*, and* $f(I_i) \xrightarrow{(b,a)} \mathrm{O}_j^+$*. We add translation arrows from* O_i^+ *to* $f(I_i)$*.*

(3) *We draw morphism arrows* $f(S_i) \to \mathrm{Id}_i$*, and* $\mathrm{Id}_i \to \tau^{-1}f(S_i)$*.*

In particular, the non-transitive vertices are precisely negative, positive and neutral presentations.

Proof. The vertices of $\Delta(Q)$ are identified with vertices of $\Delta(C^2Q)$ via minimal presentations. By Corollary 2.5, we only need to add the vertices as in (1). Step (2) is due to (2.4) and (2.4'). Note that $\tau^{-1}f(S_i)$ is equal to $f(\tau^{-1}S_i)$ if i is not a source, otherwise it is equal to O_i^+. So Step (3) is due to (2.5), (2.2'), and (2.4'). We do not need anything else because of (2.2) and (2.3). □

Due to this proposition, we will freely identify Δ_Q as a subquiver of Δ_Q^2.

From now on, we let Q be a valued quiver of Dynkin type. In this case, any indecomposable presentation f is uniquely determined by its weight vector. The quiver Δ_Q was already consider in [7, 24]. In [7] the authors associated an ice quiver to any reduced expression of the longest element w_0 in the Weyl group of Q. The iARt quiver Δ_Q only corresponds to those reduced expressions *adapted* to Q.

Example 3.7. The iARt quiver Δ_Q^2 for Q of type A_n is the ice hive quiver Δ_n constructed in [14] up to some arrows between frozen vertices.

Example 3.8 (The iARt quiver Δ_Q^2 for Q a D_4-quiver)**.**



Readers can find a few other iARt quivers in Appendix A.

Remark 3.9. One natural question is whether the iARt quivers Δ_Q^2 and $\Delta_{Q'}^2$ (or Δ_Q and $\Delta_{Q'}$) are mutation-equivalent if Q and Q' are reflection-equivalent. The answer is positive at least in trivially valued cases. We conjecture that this is also true in general. As pointed in [7, Remark 2.14], for Δ_Q with Q trivially valued, by the Tits lemma every two reduced words can be obtained form each other by a sequence of elementary 2- and 3-moves (see [39, Section 2.1]); by [39, Theorem 3.5] every such move either leaves the seed unchanged, or replaces it by an adjacent seed. Finally, similar to the proof of Corollary B.9, the result can be extended from Δ_Q to Δ_Q^2.

However, reflection-equivalent quivers can not replaced with mutation-equivalent Jacobian algebras (see Section 4.1). According to [29], the iARt quiver in Example 3.8 is mutation-equivalent to a finite mutation type quiver $E_6^{(1,1)}$, while the one

in Example 3.5 is mutation equivalent to a wild acyclic quiver, which is of infinite mutation type.

It follows from (2.1) and the fact that each Q is symmetrizable that

Lemma 3.10. *The B-matrix of Δ_Q^2 is skew-symmetrizable.*

The following lemma is an easy exercise in linear algebra.

Lemma 3.11. *The restricted B-matrices of Δ_Q, and thus of Δ_Q^2, have full ranks.*

By Lemma 3.4, the assignment $f \mapsto (\mathsf{f}_-, \mathsf{f}_+)$ is a weight configuration of Δ_Q^2. However, it is not full (see Section 1.3). We want to extend it to a full one which is useful for the second half of the paper. Since Q is of finite representation type, each non-neutral $f \in \mathrm{ind}(C^2Q)$ is translated from a unique indecomposable positive presentation, that is, $f = \tau^t(\mathrm{O}_i^+)$ for some $i \in Q_0$ and $t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$. Now for each $f \in \mathrm{ind}(C^2Q)$, we assign a triple-weight vector as follows.

Definition 3.12. If f is translated from O_i^+, then the *triple weights* $\widetilde{\mathsf{f}} \in \mathbb{Z}^{3|Q_0|}$ of f is given by $(\mathsf{e}(f), \mathsf{f}_-, \mathsf{f}_+)$ where $\mathsf{e}(f) := \mathsf{e}_i$. If $f = \mathrm{Id}_i$, then we set $\widetilde{\mathsf{f}} := (0, \mathsf{e}_i, \mathsf{e}_i)$. We also define another weight vector $\overline{\mathsf{f}}$ attached to f by $\overline{\mathsf{f}} := \mathsf{e}_i + \mathsf{f}_- - \mathsf{f}_+$.

Corollary 3.13. *The assignment $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^2 : \widetilde{\mathsf{f}} \mapsto f$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q : \overline{\mathsf{f}} \mapsto f$) defines a full weight configuration for the iARt quiver Δ_Q^2 (resp. Δ_Q).*

Proof. Due to Lemma 3.4, it suffices to show that for each mutable f

$$\sum_{g \rightarrowtail f} c_{g,f} \mathsf{e}(g) = \sum_{f \rightarrowtail h} c_{f,h} \mathsf{e}(h).$$

We call a vertex u *regular* if it is transitive and $\tau^{-1}v$ is defined for each $v \to u$, and τw is defined for each $u \to w$. It is clear from (2.1) that the equation holds at each regular vertex. From the description of Proposition 3.6, we see that all transitive vertices are regular except for $f(S_i)$ and $\tau^{-1}f(S_i)$. The problem is that these vertices may have (morphism) arrows to neutral frozen vertices, whose translation is not defined. But the first component of the triple weights of Id_i is a zero vector so the equality still holds at these vertices.

For the case of Δ_Q, it is enough to observe that the weight vector $\overline{\mathsf{f}}$ is zero on the positive and neutral frozen vertices of Δ_Q^2, and Δ_Q is obtained from Δ_Q^2 by deleting these vertices. □

We shall consider the graded upper cluster algebra $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_Q^2; \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^2)$ and the graded cluster algebra $\mathcal{C}(\Delta_Q; \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q)$ later.

4. Cluster Character from Quivers with Potentials

4.1. **Quivers with Potentials.** The mutation of quivers with potentials is invented in [12] and [13] to model the cluster algebras. In this and next section and Appendix B, we switch back to the usual quiver notation. A quiver Δ is a quadruple $(\Delta_0, \Delta_1, h, t)$, where the maps h and t map an arrow $a \in \Delta_1$ to its head and tail $h(a), t(a) \in \Delta_0$. Following [12], we define a potential W on an ice quiver Δ as a (possibly infinite) linear combination of oriented cycles in Δ. More precisely, a *potential* is an element of the *trace space* $\mathrm{Tr}(\widehat{k\Delta}) := \widehat{k\Delta}/[\widehat{k\Delta}, \widehat{k\Delta}]$, where $\widehat{k\Delta}$ is the completion of the path algebra $k\Delta$ and $[\widehat{k\Delta}, \widehat{k\Delta}]$ is the closure of the commutator

subspace of $\widehat{k\Delta}$. The pair (Δ, W) is an *ice quiver with potential*, or IQP for short. For each arrow $a \in \Delta_1$, the *cyclic derivative* ∂_a on $\widehat{k\Delta}$ is defined to be the linear extension of

$$\partial_a(a_1 \cdots a_d) = \sum_{k=1}^{d} a^*(a_k) a_{k+1} \cdots a_d a_1 \cdots a_{k-1}.$$

For each potential W, its *Jacobian ideal* ∂W is the (closed two-sided) ideal in $\widehat{k\Delta}$ generated by all $\partial_a W$. The *Jacobian algebra* $J(\Delta, W)$ is the quotient algebra $\widehat{k\Delta}/\partial W$. If W is polynomial and $J(\Delta, W)$ is finite-dimensional, then the completion is unnecessary to define $J(\Delta, W)$. This is the case throughout this paper.

The key notion introduced in [12, 13] is the *mutation* of quivers with potentials and their decorated representations. For an ice quiver with *nondegenerate potential* (see [12]), the mutation in certain sense "lifts" the mutation in Definition 1.3. We have a short review in Appendix B.1.

Definition 4.1. A *decorated representation* of a Jacobian algebra $J := J(\Delta, W)$ is a pair $\mathcal{M} = (M, M^+)$, where $M \in \mathrm{Rep}(J)$, and M^+ is a finite-dimensional k^{Δ_0}-module.

Let $\mathcal{R}ep(J)$ be the set of decorated representations of $J(\Delta, W)$ up to isomorphism. Let $K^2 J$ be the homotopy category of $C^2 J$. There is a bijection between two additive categories $\mathcal{R}ep(J)$ and $K^2 J$ mapping any representation M to its minimal presentation in $\mathrm{Rep}(J)$, and the simple representation S_u^+ of k^{Δ_0} to $P_u \to 0$. Suppose that $\mathcal{M}$ corresponds to a projective presentation $P(\beta_+) \to P(\beta_-)$.

Definition 4.2. The g-*vector* $\mathsf{g}(\mathcal{M})$ of a decorated representation $\mathcal{M}$ is the reduced weight vector $\beta_+ - \beta_-$.

Definition 4.3. A potential W is called *rigid* on a quiver Δ if every potential on Δ is cyclically equivalent to an element in the Jacobian ideal ∂W. Such a QP (Δ, W) is also called *rigid*. A potential W is called μ-*rigid* on an ice quiver Δ if its restriction to the mutable part Δ^μ is rigid.

It is known [12, Proposition 8.1, Corollary 6.11] that every rigid QP is 2-acyclic, and the rigidity is preserved under mutations. In particular, any rigid QP is non-degenerate.

Definition 4.4. Two QPs (Δ, W) and (Δ', W') on the same vertex set Δ_0 are call *right-equivalent* if there is an isomorphism $\varphi : k\Delta \to k\Delta'$ such that $\varphi\,|_{k\Delta_0} = \mathrm{Id}$ and $\varphi(W)$ is cyclically equivalent to W'. Two IQPs (Δ, W) and (Δ', W') are call μ-*right-equivalent* if they are right-equivalent when restricted to their mutable parts.

Definition 4.5. A representation is called μ-*supported* if its supporting vertices are all mutable. We denote by $\mathcal{R}ep^\mu(J)$ the category of all μ-supported decorated representations of J.

Remark 4.6. If (Δ, W) and (Δ', W') are μ-right-equivalent, then $\mathcal{R}ep^\mu(J)$ and $\mathcal{R}ep^\mu(J')$ are equivalent. Indeed, we write $W = W_\mu + W_\diamond$ where W_μ is the restriction of W to the mutable part of Δ. We find that any cyclic derivative $\partial_a W_\diamond$ is a sum of paths passing some frozen vertices. Such a sum gives rise to a trivial relation on the μ-supported representations.

4.2. **The Generic Cluster Character.**

Definition 4.7. To any $\mathsf{g} \in \mathbb{Z}^{\Delta_0}$ we associate the *reduced* presentation space

$$\mathrm{PHom}_J(\mathsf{g}) := \mathrm{Hom}_J(P([\mathsf{g}]_+), P([-\mathsf{g}]_+)),$$

where $[\mathsf{g}]_+$ is the vector satisfying $[\mathsf{g}]_+(u) = \max(\mathsf{g}(u), 0)$. We denote by $\mathrm{Coker}(\mathsf{g})$ the cokernel of a general presentation in $\mathrm{PHom}_J(\mathsf{g})$.

Reader should be aware that $\mathrm{Coker}(\mathsf{g})$ is just a notation rather than a specific representation. If we write $M = \mathrm{Coker}(\mathsf{g})$, this simply means that we take a presentation general enough (according to context) in $\mathrm{PHom}_J(\mathsf{g})$, then let M to be its cokernel.

Definition 4.8. A g-vector g is called *μ-supported* if $\mathrm{Coker}(\mathsf{g})$ is μ-supported. Let $G(\Delta, W)$ be the set of all μ-supported g-vectors in $\mathbb{Z}^{\Delta_0}$.

It turns out that for a large class of IQPs the set $G(\Delta, W)$ is given by lattice points in some rational polyhedral cone. Such a class includes the IQPs introduced in [14, 15, 16], and the ones to be introduced in Section 5.1.

Definition 4.9 ([37])**.** We define the *generic character* $C_W : G(\Delta, W) \to \mathbb{Z}(\mathbf{x})$ by

$$C_W(\mathsf{g}) = \mathbf{x}^{\mathsf{g}} \sum_{\mathsf{e}} \chi\big(\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathsf{e}}(\mathrm{Coker}(\mathsf{g}))\big)\mathbf{y}^{\mathsf{e}}, \tag{4.1}$$

where $\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathsf{e}}(M)$ is the variety parametrizing e-dimensional quotient representations of M, and $\chi(-)$ denotes the topological Euler-characteristic.

Theorem 4.10 ([14, Corollary 5.14], *cf.* [37, Theorem 1.1])**.** *Suppose that IQP (Δ, W) is non-degenerate and B_Δ has full rank. The generic character C_W maps $G(\Delta, W)$ (bijectively) to a set of linearly independent elements in $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta)$ containing all cluster monomials.*

Definition 4.11. We say that an IQP (Δ, W) *models* an algebra $\mathcal{C}$ if the generic cluster character maps $G(\Delta, W)$ (bijectively) onto a basis of $\mathcal{C}$. If $\mathcal{C}$ is the upper cluster algebra $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta)$, then we simply say that (Δ, W) is a *cluster model*.

Remark 4.12. Suppose that (Δ, W) and (Δ', W') are μ-right-equivalent. By Remark 4.6, $\mathcal{R}ep^\mu(J)$ and $\mathcal{R}ep^\mu(J')$ are equivalent via some isomorphism $\varphi : k\Delta^\mu \to k(\Delta')^\mu$. By abuse of notation we denote the equivalence also by φ. Since $\varphi\,|_{\Delta_0} = \mathrm{Id}$, $\varphi(M)$ and M are isomorphic and have the same g-vector. We see from (4.1) that if (Δ, W) is a cluster model, then so is (Δ', W').

5. iARt QPs

5.1. **The iARt QP (Δ_Q^2, W_Q^2).** For the time being, let us assume Q is a trivially valued Dynkin quiver. A *translation triangle* in an iARt quiver is an oriented cycle of the form



For each iARt quiver Δ_Q^2, we define the potential W_Q^2 as an alternating sum of all translation triangles. We make this more precise as follows. We can also label each

non-neutral $f = \tau^{-t}\,\mathrm{O}_i^-$ by the pair $(i,t)^* = (i^*(f), t^*(f))$. The arrows of Δ_Q^2 are thus classified into three classes

$$\begin{aligned}
&\textit{Type A arrows} && (i,t)^* \to (j,t+1)^*,\ f(S_i) \to \mathrm{Id}_i;\\
&\textit{Type B arrows} && (i,t)^* \to (j,t)^*,\ \mathrm{Id}_i \to \tau^{-1}f(S_i);\\
&\textit{Type C arrows} && (i,t)^* \dashrightarrow (i,t-1)^*.
\end{aligned}$$

Let a (resp. b and c) denote the sum of all type A (B and C) arrows. The potential W_Q^2 is defined as $acb - abc$. Thus the Jacobian ideal is generated by the elements

$$(ac-ca)e_u,\ (cb-bc)e_u,\ (ba-ab)e_u. \tag{5.1}$$

When v is frozen, the first two generators change into the following because some translation arrows are undefined.

$$ace_v,\ (cb-bc)e_v \qquad \text{for } v \text{ negative,} \tag{5.2}$$

$$cae_v,\ cbe_v \qquad \text{for } v \text{ positive,} \tag{5.3}$$

$$cae_v,\ e_vbc \qquad \text{for } v \text{ neutral.} \tag{5.4}$$

Let $J := J(\Delta_Q^2, W_Q^2)$ be the Jacobian algebra of (Δ_Q^2, W_Q^2). By the relations (5.1), any (equivalence class of) a nonzero path in J can be written as $a^rb^sc^te_v$ for some $r,s,t \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}$. Moreover, the order of a,b,c does not matter. The proof of the following lemma is almost the same as [12, Example 8.7].

Lemma 5.1. *The IQP (Δ_Q^2, W_Q^2) is rigid and $J(\Delta_Q^2, W_Q^2)$ is finite-dimensional.*

We delete all translation arrows of Δ_Q^2, and obtain a subquiver denoted by $\wedge_Q^2$. Let R be the direct sum of all presentations in $\mathrm{ind}(C^2Q)$. It is well-known that the *Auslander algebra* $A_Q^2 := \mathrm{End}_{C^2Q}(R)$ is equal to $k\wedge_Q^2$ modulo the *mesh relations* [2, VII.1]. The Auslander algebra A_Q^2 is the quotient of Jacobian algebra J by the ideal generated by translation arrows.

Let $f : P_+ \to P_-$ be a presentation in $\mathrm{ind}(C^2Q)$. We denote by $\boldsymbol{P}_f$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{I}_f$) the indecomposable projective (resp. injective) representation of J corresponding to the vertex f. For $j \in Q_0$, let $j^* = i^*(\mathrm{O}_j^+) \in Q_0$. It is well-known that $j \mapsto j^*$ is a (possibly trivial) involution. The involution does not depend on the orientation of Q. Its formula is listed in [24, Section 2.3].

Lemma 5.2. *We have the following for the module $\boldsymbol{P}_f$ in $J(\Delta_Q^2, W_Q^2)$*

(1) $\boldsymbol{P}_f(\mathrm{O}_i^-) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_{i^*(f)}, P_i)$;
(2) $\boldsymbol{P}_f(\mathrm{O}_i^+) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_+, P_i)$;
(3) $\boldsymbol{P}_f(\mathrm{Id}_i) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_-, P_i)$.

Proof. (1). We write a path in $\boldsymbol{P}_f(\mathrm{O}_i^-)$ as $p = a^rb^sc^te_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}$. We have that $s+t>0$ unless the path is trivial. Our desired result follows from the claim that $t = t^*(f)$ and $r = 0$. If $t = 0$ thus $s > 0$, then it is clear that $r = 0$. If $t \neq 0$ and $r \neq 0$, then p is equivalent to zero by (5.1) and (5.2). We know that $\mathrm{Hom}_{C^2(Q)}(f, \mathrm{O}_i^-) = 0$ unless f is negative. This implies $t = t^*(f)$.

(2). We write a path in $\boldsymbol{P}_f(\mathrm{O}_i^+)$ as $p = b^sc^ta^re_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}$. We have that $r+s>0$ otherwise the path is trivial. We observe that any path from f to O_i^+ containing a translation arrow must be equivalent to zero due to the relations (5.1) and (5.3).

So $\boldsymbol{P}_f(\mathrm{O}_i^+)$ is the same as $\boldsymbol{P}_f(\mathrm{O}_i^+)$ restricted to the Auslander algebra. The result follows from Lemma 2.6.(4).

(3). Similar to (2), any path from f to Id_i containing a translation arrow must be equivalent to zero. The result follows from Lemma 2.6.(2). □

Remark 5.3. Let J^μ be the Jacobian algebra of (Δ_Q^2, W_Q^2) restricted to the mutable part Δ_Q^μ of Δ_Q^2. By the results in [24, 4] (see Appendix B.2 for more detail), J^μ is the graded algebra $\bigoplus_{f,g\in(\Delta_Q^\mu)_0,t}\mathrm{Hom}_{C^2Q}(\tau^t f, g)$. In particular, we have that $\boldsymbol{P}_f(g)\cong\bigoplus_{t=0}^{t^*(f)}\mathrm{Hom}_{C^2Q}(\tau^t f, g)$ if both f and g are mutable. We do not need this result though.

5.2. **The Cone $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2}$.** We consider the following set of representations T_v

$$0\to T_v\to \boldsymbol{I}_v\to\bigoplus_{i\to j}\boldsymbol{I}_{\mathrm{O}_j^-} \qquad \text{for } v=\mathrm{O}_i^-, \tag{5.5}$$

$$0\to T_v\to \boldsymbol{I}_v\to\bigoplus_{i\to j}\boldsymbol{I}_{\mathrm{O}_j^+} \qquad \text{for } v=\mathrm{O}_i^+, \tag{5.6}$$

$$0\to T_v\to \boldsymbol{I}_v\to\bigoplus_{i\to j}\boldsymbol{I}_{\mathrm{Id}_j} \qquad \text{for } v=\mathrm{Id}_i. \tag{5.7}$$

For any map between projective modules $f: P(\beta_1)\to P(\beta_2)$, the *i-th top restriction* of f is the induced map $\mathrm{top}\,P(\beta_1(i))\to\mathrm{top}\,P(\beta_2(i))$.

Theorem 5.4. *We have the following description for the modules T_v.*

1. *The module $T_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}$ is the indecomposable module supported on all vertices translated from $\mathrm{O}_{i^*}^+$ with dimension vector $(1,1,\dots,1)$;*
2. *The defining linear map $f\to g$ in $T_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}$ is given by the i-th top restriction of φ_+;*
3. *The defining linear map $f\to g$ in T_{Id_i} is given by the i-th top restriction of φ_-,*

where $\varphi=(\varphi_+,\varphi_-)$ is the irreducible morphism from f to g.

In particular, the dimension vector θ_v of T_v is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
&\theta_v(f)=\mathsf{e}(f)(i^*) && \text{for } v=\mathrm{O}_i^-,\\
&\theta_v(f)=\mathsf{f}_+(i) && \text{for } v=\mathrm{O}_i^+,\\
&\theta_v(f)=\mathsf{f}_-(i) && \text{for } v=\mathrm{Id}_i\,.
\end{aligned}$$

Proof. By Lemma 5.2.(1), we can identify $\boldsymbol{I}_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}(f)$ with $\mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_{i^*(f)},P_i)^*$. From the definition of $T_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}$ and the exact sequence

$$0\to\bigoplus_{i\to j}\mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_{i^*(f)},P_j)\to\mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_{i^*(f)},P_i)\to\mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_{i^*(f)},S_i)\to 0,$$

we conclude that $T_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}(f)=\mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_{i^*(f)},S_i)^*$.

By Lemma 5.2.(2), we can identify $\boldsymbol{I}_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}(f)$ with $\mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_+,P_i)^*$. From the definition of $T_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}$ and the exact sequence

$$0\to\bigoplus_{i\to j}\mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_+,P_j)\to\mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_+,P_i)\to\mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_+,S_i)\to 0,$$

we conclude that $T_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}(f) = \mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_+, S_i)^*$. The description of maps follows from the naturality.

By Lemma 5.2.(3), we can identify $\boldsymbol{I}_{\mathrm{Id}_i}(f)$ with $\mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_-, P_i)^*$. From the definition of T_{Id_i} and the exact sequence

$$0 \to \bigoplus_{i \to j} \mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_-, P_j) \to \mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_-, P_i) \to \mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_-, S_i) \to 0,$$

we conclude that $T_{\mathrm{Id}_i}(f) = \mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_-, S_i)^*$ and the description of maps follows from the naturality. □

Definition 5.5. A vertex v is called *maximal* in a representation M if $\dim M(v) = 1$ and all strict subrepresentations of M are not supported on v.

We note that every T_v contains a maximal vertex w, which is another frozen vertex. For example, $w = \mathrm{O}_{i*}^+$ (resp. Id_i and O_i^-) for $v = \mathrm{O}_i^-$ (resp. O_i^+ and Id_i).

Lemma 5.6. [14, Lemma 6.5] *Suppose that a representation T contains a maximal vertex. Let $M = \mathrm{Coker}(\mathsf{g})$, then $\mathrm{Hom}_J(M, T) = 0$ if and only if $\mathsf{g}(\underline{\dim} S) \geq 0$ for all subrepresentations S of T.*

Lemma 5.7. *Let $M = \mathrm{Coker}(\mathsf{g})$, then $\mathrm{Hom}_J(M, T_v) = 0$ for each frozen v if and only if $\mathrm{Hom}_J(M, I_v) = 0$ for each frozen v.*

Proof. Since each subrepresentation of T_v is also a subrepresentation of I_v, one direction is clear. Conversely, let us assume that $\mathrm{Hom}_J(M, T_v) = 0$ for each frozen vertex v. We prove that $\mathrm{Hom}_J(M, I_v) = 0$ by induction.

We first notice that for $v = \mathrm{O}_i^-, \mathrm{O}_i^+, \mathrm{Id}_i$, $T_v = I_v$ if i is a sink. In general, for an injective presentation of T: $0 \to T \to I_1 \to I_0$ with $\mathrm{Hom}_J(M, I_0) = 0$, we have that $\mathrm{Hom}_J(M, I_1) = 0$ is equivalent to $\mathrm{Hom}_J(M, T) = 0$. Now we perform the induction from a sink i in an appropriate order using (5.5)–(5.7). We can conclude that $\mathrm{Hom}_J(M, I_v) = 0$ for all frozen v. □

Definition 5.8. We define a cone $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2} \subset \mathbb{R}^{(\Delta_Q^2)_0}$ by $\mathsf{g}(\underline{\dim} S) \geq 0$ for all strict subrepresentations $S \subseteq T_v$ and all frozen v.

Theorem 5.9. *The set of lattice points $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{(\Delta_Q^2)_0}$ is exactly $G(\Delta_Q^2, W_Q^2)$.*

Proof. Due to Lemma 5.6 and 5.7, it suffices to show that $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2}$ is defined by $\mathsf{g}(\underline{\dim} S) \geq 0$ for all subrepresentations S of T_v and all v frozen. We notice that these conditions are the union of the defining conditions of $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2}$ and $\mathsf{g}(\underline{\dim} T_v) \geq 0$. But the latter conditions are redundant because $\underline{\dim} T_v = \mathsf{e}_w + (\underline{\dim} T_v - \mathsf{e}_w)$ and $\underline{\dim} T_v - \mathsf{e}_w$ is the dimension vector of a strict subrepresentation of T_v, where w is the maximal (frozen) vertex of T_v. □

Example 5.10 (Example 3.8 continued)**.** In this case, it is almost trivial to list all strict subrepresentations for all T_v. Readers can easily find that there are 3 subrepresentations for all O_i^-, and $7, 6, 1, 1$ subrepresentations for $\mathrm{O}_1^+, \mathrm{O}_2^+, \mathrm{O}_3^+, \mathrm{O}_4^+$ respectively, and $1, 2, 7, 7$ subrepresentations for $\mathrm{Id}_1, \mathrm{Id}_2, \mathrm{Id}_3, \mathrm{Id}_4$ respectively. All these subrepresentations are needed to define $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2}$, so there are 44 inequalities. This example can be easily generalized to Q of type D_n with a similar orientation.

Remark 5.11 (The Valued Cases). To deal with the general valued quiver Q, we could have worked with species analogue of QP, but this require some lengthy preparation. To avoid this we can define the analogous Jacobian algebra by the Ext-completion algebra $\prod_{i\geq 0}\operatorname{Ext}^2_A(A^*,A)^{\otimes_A i}$ for the Auslander algebra $A:=A^2_Q$.

We can even define $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta^2_Q}$ without introducing the Jacobian algebra. Without the Jacobian algebra we are unable to define the module T_v by injective presentations, but it still makes perfect sense to define T_v via Theorem 5.4. Once T_v's are defined, we define the cones $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta^2_Q}$ by Definition 5.8. The same remark also applies for the cone G_{Δ_Q} to be defined below.

In general, some of the defining conditions of $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta^2_Q}$ may be redundant as shown in the following example.

Example 5.12. The most complicated T_v for Q of type G_2 (see Example 1.2 and Appendix A) is T_{Id_1}. Its dimension vector is



, and it strict subrepresentations have 13 distinct dimension vectors. However, we only need 5 of them to define $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta^2_Q}$.

Now we come back to the iARt quiver Δ_Q. We define a potential W_Q on Δ_Q by the same formula defining W^2_Q. The iARt QP (Δ_Q,W_Q) is nothing but the restriction of (Δ^2_Q,W^2_Q) to the subquiver Δ_Q. For each O^-_i, we define the representation $T_{\mathrm{O}^-_i}$ of $J(\Delta_Q,W_Q)$ by the same injective presentation (5.5). Similar to Theorem 5.4.(1), the module $T_{\mathrm{O}^-_i}$ is the indecomposable module supported on all vertices translated from $\mathrm{O}^+_{i^*}$ with dimension vector $(1,1,\dots,1)$.

We define a cone $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q}\subset\mathbb{R}^{(\Delta_Q)_0}$ by $\mathsf{g}(\underline{\dim}S)\geq 0$ for all subrepresentations $S\subseteq T_{\mathrm{O}^-_i}$ and all i. Note that we ask all subrepresentations not just strict ones. We observe that the defining conditions of G_{Δ_Q} and those of $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta^2_Q}$ are related as follows. We group the defining conditions of $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta^2_Q}$ into three sets

$$\mathsf{g}H_u\geq 0,\ \mathsf{g}H_l\geq 0,\ \mathsf{g}H_r\geq 0.$$

They arise from the subrepresentations of T_v for v negative, neutral and positive respectively. Then the defining conditions of G_{Δ_Q} are exactly $\mathsf{g}H_u\geq 0$.

Similar to Theorem 5.9, we have the following proposition.

Proposition 5.13. *The set of lattice points* $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q}\cap\mathbb{Z}^{(\Delta_Q)_0}$ *is exactly* $G(\Delta_Q,W_Q)$.

Definition 5.14. Given a weight configuration $\boldsymbol{\sigma}$ of a quiver Δ and a convex polyhedral cone $\mathsf{G}\subset\mathbb{R}^{\Delta_0}$, we define the (not necessarily bounded) convex polytope $\mathsf{G}(\sigma)$ as G cut out by the hyperplane sections $\mathsf{g}\boldsymbol{\sigma}=\sigma$.

Our conjectural model for the tensor multiplicity is that the multiplicity $c^\lambda_{\mu,\nu}$ is counted by $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta^2_Q}(\mu,\nu,\lambda)$ for the weight configuration $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2_Q$. We will prove this model for G of type ADE in Part 2.

A. A List of some iARt Quivers

For Q of type B, C and D, we only draw the iARt quiver Δ_Q^2 for B_3, C_3 and D_5 (D_4 is our running example). Reader should have no difficulty to draw the general ones. The cases of E_7 and E_8 are not hard, but they are too large to draw. We label the vertices of Q in the same way as the software LiE [33] so that you can check things conveniently.

G_2



B_3



C_3



D_5





Part 2. Isomorphism to Configuration Spaces

6. Cluster Structure of Maximal Unipotent Groups

6.1. **Basic Notation for a Simple Lie Group.** Let k be an algebraically closed field of characteristic zero. From now on, G will always be a simple connected linear algebraic group over k with Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$. We assume that the Dynkin diagram of $\mathfrak{g}$ is the underlying valued graph of Q. The Lie algebra $\mathfrak{g}$ has the Cartan decomposition $\mathfrak{g} = \mathfrak{n}^- \oplus \mathfrak{h} \oplus \mathfrak{n}$. Let $e_i, \alpha_i^\vee$, and f_i ($i \in Q_0$) be the Chevalley generators of $\mathfrak{g}$. The *simple coroots* $\alpha_i^\vee$ of $\mathfrak{g}$ form a basis of a Cartan subalgebra $\mathfrak{h}$. The *simple roots* α_i ($i \in Q_0$) form a basis in the dual space $\mathfrak{h}^*$ such that $[h, e_i] = \alpha_i(h)e_i$, and $[h, f_i] = -\alpha_i(h)f_i$ for any $h \in \mathfrak{h}$ and $i \in Q_0$. The structure of $\mathfrak{g}$ is uniquely

determined by the *Cartan matrix* $C(G) = (c'_{i,j})$ given by $c'_{i,j} = \alpha_j(\alpha_i^\vee)$. We have that $c'_{i,i} = 2$ and $c'_{i,j} = -c_{j,i}$ so we have that $C(G) = E_l(Q) + E_r(Q)^T$.

Let U^-, H and $U := U^+$ be closed subgroups of G with Lie algebras $\mathfrak{n}^-$, $\mathfrak{h}$ and $\mathfrak{n}$. Thus H is a *maximal torus*, and U^- and U are two opposite *maximal unipotent subgroups* of G. Let $U_i^\pm$ ($i \in Q_0$) be the simple root subgroup of $U^\pm$. By abuse of notation, we let $\alpha_i^\vee : \mathbb{G}_m \to H$ be the simple coroot corresponding to the root $\alpha_i : H \to \mathbb{G}_m$. For all $i \in Q_0$, there are isomorphisms $x_i : \mathbb{G}_a \to U_i^+$ and $x_{\overline{i}} : \mathbb{G}_a \to U_i^-$ such that the maps

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & a \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \mapsto x_i(a), \quad \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ b & 1 \end{pmatrix} \mapsto x_{\overline{i}}(b), \quad \begin{pmatrix} t & 0 \\ 0 & t^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \mapsto \alpha_i^\vee(t)$$

provide homomorphisms $\phi_i : \mathrm{SL}_2 \to G$. We denote by $g \mapsto g^T$ the transpose anti-automorphism of G defined by

$$x_i(a)^T = x_{\overline{i}}(a),\ x_{\overline{i}}(b)^T = x_i(b),\ h^T = h,\ (i \in Q_0, h \in H).$$

Let s_i ($i \in Q_0$) be the simple reflections generating the Weyl group of G. Set

$$\overline{s_i} := x_i(-1)x_{\overline{i}}(1)x_i(-1).$$

The elements $\overline{s_i}$ satisfy the braid relations. So we can associate to each $w \in W$ its representative $\overline{w}$ in such a way that for any reduced decomposition $w = s_{i_1} \cdots s_{i_\ell}$ one has $\overline{w} = \overline{s_{i_1}} \cdots \overline{s_{i_\ell}}$. Denote by w_0 be the longest element of the Weyl group. In general $\overline{w_0}^2$ is not the identity but an order two central element in G. It is well-known that $w_0(\alpha_i) = -\alpha_{i^*}$, where $i \mapsto i^*$ is the same involution in Section 5.1.

The *weight lattice* $P(G)$ of G consists of all $\gamma \in \mathfrak{h}^*$ such that $\gamma(\alpha_i^\vee) \in \mathbb{Z}$ for all i. Thus $P(G)$ has a $\mathbb{Z}$-basis $\{\varpi_i\}_{i \in Q_0}$ of *fundamental weights* given by $\varpi_j(\alpha_i^\vee) = \delta_{i,j}$. We can thus identify a weight by an integral vector $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$. We write $\varpi(\lambda)$ for $\sum_i \lambda(i)\varpi_i$. In this notation, $\varpi_i = \varpi(\mathsf{e}_i)$. We stress that throughout the paper, this identification is widely used. A weight $\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$ is *dominant* if it is non-negative.

6.2. **The Base Affine Space.** The natural $G \times G$-action on G:

$$(g_1, g_2) \cdot g = g_1 g g_2^{-1},$$

induces the left and right translation of G on $k[G]$:

$$(g_1, g_2)\varphi(g) = \varphi(g_1^{-1} g g_2) \ \text{ for } \varphi \in k[G].$$

The algebraic Peter-Weyl theorem [28, Theorem 4.2.7] says that as a $G \times G$-module $k[G]$ decomposes as

$$k[G] = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}^{Q_0}} L(\lambda)^\vee \otimes L(\lambda),$$

where $L(\lambda)$ is the irreducible G-module of highest-weight $\varpi(\lambda)$, and $L(\lambda)^\vee$ is its dual. Quotienting out the left translation of U^-, we get a G-module decomposition of the coordinate ring of the *base affine space* $\mathcal{A} := U^- \backslash G$:

$$k[\mathcal{A}] = \left\{ f \in k[G] \mid f(u^- g) = f(g) \text{ for } u^- \in U^-,\ g \in G \right\} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}^{Q_0}} L(\lambda).$$

Each G-module $L(\lambda)$ can be realized as the subspace of $k[\mathcal{A}]$:

$$L(\lambda) \cong \left\{ f \in k[\mathcal{A}] \mid f(hg) = h^{\varpi(\lambda)} f(g) \text{ for } h \in H,\ g \in G \right\}. \tag{6.1}$$

Similarly for the *dual* base affine space $\mathcal{A}^\vee := G/U$, we have that

$$k[\mathcal{A}^\vee] = \{f \in k[G] \mid f(gu) = f(g) \text{ for } u \in U,\ g \in G\} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geqslant 0}^{Q_0}} L(\lambda)^\vee,$$

$$L(\lambda)^\vee \cong \left\{ f \in k[\mathcal{A}^\vee] \mid f(gh) = h^{\varpi(\lambda)} f(g) \text{ for } h \in H,\ g \in G \right\}. \tag{6.2}$$

Keep in mind that the G-actions on $k[U^-\backslash G]$ and $k[G/U]$ are via the right and left translations respectively.

We remarks that the base affine space $\mathcal{A}$ is *not* affine. We fix an additive character $U^- \to \mathbb{G}_a$, then a coset U^-g (resp. gU) determines a point in $\mathcal{A}$ (resp. $\mathcal{A}^\vee$). We refer readers to [27, 1.1.1] for the detail.

For each fundamental representation $L(\mathsf{e}_i)$ and its dual $L(\mathsf{e}_i)^\vee$, we choose a U^--fixed vector u_i and a U-fixed vector $u_i^\vee$, normalized by $\langle u_i^\vee \mid u_i \rangle = 1$. Following [20] we define for each fundamental weight ϖ_i and each pair $w, w' \in W$ the *generalized minor* $m_{w,w'}^{\varpi_i} \in k[G]$

$$g \mapsto \langle \overline{w} u_i^\vee \mid g\overline{w'} u_i \rangle. \tag{6.3}$$

More concretely, the Bruhat decomposition $G = \coprod_{w \in W} U^- H w U$ implies that any $g \in G$ can be written as $g = u^- h \overline{w} u$. Suppose that g lies in the open set $G_0 := U^- H U$, then the regular function $m^{\varpi_i} := m_{e,e}^{\varpi_i}$ restricted to G_0 is given by $m^{\varpi_i}(g) = h^{\varpi_i}$ (For the type A_r, this is a principal minors of a matrix g). Then the definition of m^{ϖ_i} can be extended to whole G as in [20, Proposition 2.4].

Proposition 6.1. *For $g = u^- h \overline{w} u \in G$, we have that*

$$m^{\varpi_i}(g) = h^{\varpi_i} \text{ if } w(\varpi_i) = \varpi_i \quad \text{and} \quad m^{\varpi_i}(g) = 0 \text{ otherwise.}$$

The function $m_{w,w'}^{\varpi_i}$ is then given by

$$m_{w,w'}^{\varpi_i}(g) = m^{\varpi_i}(\overline{w}^{-1} g \overline{w'}). \tag{6.4}$$

It follows from (6.4) or (6.3) that

Lemma 6.2. *The weight for the $H \times H$-action on $m_{w,w'}^{\varpi^i}$ is $(w(\varpi_i), -w'(\varpi_i))$, i.e.,*

$$m_{w,w'}^{\varpi_i}(h_1 g h_2^{-1}) = h_1^{w(\varpi_i)} h_2^{-w'(\varpi_i)} m_{w,w'}^{\varpi_i}(g).$$

6.3. **Cluster Structure on $k[U]$.** Now we are ready to recall the cluster algebra structure of $k[U]$. For this, we associate to each non-neutral indecomposable presentation f, a generalized minor m_f as follows. Suppose that $\mathsf{e}(f) = \mathsf{e}_i$, i.e., f is translated from O_i^+, and moreover $w(\varpi_i) = \varpi(\mathsf{f})$, then we put $m_f := m_{e,w}^{\varpi_i}$. Note that if f is positive, then $f = m_{e,e}^{\varpi_i}$ is a principal minor. We take the iARt quiver Δ_Q, and let $\mathcal{M}_Q := \{m_f\}_{f \in (\Delta_Q)_0}$. It is known [7, 24] that $k[U]$ is the cluster algebra with this *standard* seed $(\Delta_Q, \mathcal{M}_Q)$. Here we again identify Δ_Q as the subquiver of Δ_Q^2. Moreover, the cluster algebra is equal to its upper cluster algebra [25].

Recall the weight configuration $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q$ in Definition 3.12. For each vertex $f \in (\Delta_Q)_0$, we set $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q(f) = \mathsf{e}(f) - \mathsf{f}$. By Lemma 6.2 the degree of m_f for the conjugation action of H is exactly $\varpi(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q(f))$. Let $\boldsymbol{\rho}_Q$ be the matrix with rows also indexed by $(\Delta_Q)_0$ such that $\boldsymbol{\rho}_Q(f)$ is the positive root of G corresponding to f, i.e., $\boldsymbol{\rho}_Q(f) = \sum_i \dim(M(i))\alpha(i)$ where $M = \mathrm{Coker}(f)$. Note that by the *generalized Gabriel's*

theorem [9], $\boldsymbol{\rho}_Q$ contains exactly all positive roots of G. The *Kostant's partition function* $p_Q(\gamma)$ by definition counts the lattice points in the polytope

$$\mathsf{K}(\gamma) := \{\mathsf{h} \geq 0 \mid h\boldsymbol{\rho}_Q = \gamma\}.$$

Now we consider a labelling dual to the one in Section 5.1. Let $(i,t) = (i(f), t(f))$ be the number such that $f = \tau^t(\mathrm{O}_i^+)$. Note that $i(f)^* = i^*(f)$ and $t(f) + t^*(f) = t\big(\mathrm{O}^-_{i^*(f)}\big) = t^*\big(\mathrm{O}^+_{i(f)}\big)$.

Lemma 6.3. $\varpi\left(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q(f)\right) = \sum_{t=0}^{t(f)-1} \boldsymbol{\rho}_Q(\tau^{-t}f)$.

Proof. Let $M = \mathrm{Coker}(f)$. The equality is equivalent to that

$$\mathsf{e}(f) - \mathsf{f} = \left(\sum_{t=0}^{t(f)-1} \underline{\dim}(\tau^{-t}M)\right) C(G).$$

Recall that the Cartan matrix $C(G)$ is equal to $E_l(Q) + E_r(Q)^T$. It follows from the definition that matrix $E_l(Q)$ transforms $-\underline{\dim}M$ to the reduced weight vector of $f(M)$, and $E_r(Q)^T$ transforms $\underline{\dim}M$ to the reduced weight vector $\mathsf{f}^\vee(M)$ of the minimal injective presentation of M, or equivalently, $\mathsf{f}^\vee(M) = -\mathsf{f}(\tau^{-1}M)$. So the righthand side is equal to

$$\sum_{t=0}^{t(f)-1} -\mathsf{f}(\tau^{-t}M) - \mathsf{f}^\vee(\tau^{-t}M).$$

After some cancellations, only two terms survive. They are $\mathsf{e}(f)$ and $-\mathsf{f} = -\mathsf{f}(M)$. □

For the weight configuration $\varpi(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q) := \{\varpi(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q(f))\}_{f\in(\Delta_Q)_0}$ and the polyhedral cone G_{Δ_Q}, we consider the polytope $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q}(\gamma)$ as in Definition 5.14.

Lemma 6.4. *The function* $|\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q}(-) \cap \mathbb{Z}^{(\Delta_Q)_0}|$ *is the partition function* $p_Q(-)$.

Proof. Recall that $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q}(\gamma)$ is defined by $\sum_{t=0}^{t^*(f)} \mathsf{g}(\tau^t f) \geq 0$ for $f \in (\Delta_Q)_0$ and $\mathsf{g}\varpi(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q) = \gamma$. We introduce new variables $\mathsf{h}(f)$ for each f satisfying that $\mathsf{h}(f) = \sum_{t=0}^{t^*(f)} \mathsf{g}(\tau^t f)$. Then

$$\mathsf{h}\boldsymbol{\rho}_Q = \sum_f \sum_{t=0}^{t^*(f)} \mathsf{g}(\tau^t f)\boldsymbol{\rho}_Q(f) = \sum_f \sum_{t=0}^{t(f)-1} \mathsf{g}(f)\boldsymbol{\rho}_Q(\tau^{-t}f) = \mathsf{g}\varpi(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q).$$

The second equality is established through an easy bijection and the last one is due to Lemma 6.3. So the defining condition for $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q}(\gamma)$ is equivalent to that for the polytope $\mathsf{K}(\gamma)$. Finally, we observe that the transformation from g to h is totally unimodular. In particular, the transformation and its inverse perverse lattice points. □

Theorem 6.5. *The coordinate ring of U is equal to the graded cluster algebra $\mathcal{C}\left(\Delta_Q, \mathcal{M}_Q; \varpi(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q)\right)$. Moreover, if Q is trivially valued, then (Δ_Q, W_Q) is a cluster model (Definition 4.11).*

Proof. We only need to prove the second statement. Recall that the universal enveloping algebra $U(\mathfrak{n})$ has a standard grading by $\deg(e_i) = \alpha_i$. It is a classical

fact [30] that the partition function $p_Q(\gamma)$ counts the dimension of the homogeneous component $U(\mathfrak{n})_\gamma$. The algebra $k[U]$ is graded dual to $U(\mathfrak{n})$ with (see [40])

$$k[U]_\gamma = \left\{\varphi \in k[U] \mid \varphi(huh^{-1}) = h^\gamma \varphi(u) \text{ for } h \in H,\ u \in U\right\}.$$

We have seen that the degree of $\mathcal{M}_Q(f) = m_f$ is $\varpi(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q(f))$. So the second statement follows from Theorem 4.10, Lemma 6.4, and the fact that $\mathcal{C}(\Delta_Q) = \overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_Q)$. □

There are another two seeds of this cluster structure of $k[U]$. One is called *left standard*, and the other is called *right standard*. Both are obtained from the standard seed by a sequence of mutations. The sequences of mutations $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_r$ will be defined and studied in Appendix B. Let

$$\left(\widetilde{\Delta}_Q^\#, \widetilde{W}_Q^\#, \mathcal{M}_Q^\#; \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^\#\right) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_\#(\Delta_Q, W_Q, \mathcal{M}_Q; \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q) \text{ for } \# = l, r.$$

For what follows in this Section, # always represents l and r. Let Δ_Q^l (resp. Δ_Q^r) be the ice quiver obtained from Δ_Q^2 by deleting the negative and positive (resp. negative and neutral) frozen vertices. By Corollary B.11, $\widetilde{\Delta}_Q^\#$ and $\Delta_Q^\#$ are equal up to arrows between frozen vertices. Since the QP (Δ_Q, W_Q) is rigid, so is $(\widetilde{\Delta}_Q^\#, \widetilde{W}_Q^\#)$. Let $W_Q^\#$ be the potential W_Q^2 restricted to $\Delta_Q^\#$. By [12, Proposition 8.9] $(\Delta_Q^\#, W_Q^\#)$ is also rigid. In particular, both $(\widetilde{\Delta}_Q^\#, \widetilde{W}_Q^\#)$ and $(\Delta_Q^\#, W_Q^\#)$ are μ-rigid. By the equivalent definition of rigidity ([12, Definition 6.10, Remark 6.8]), $(\widetilde{\Delta}_Q^\#, \widetilde{W}_Q^\#)$ is μ-right-equivalent to $(\Delta_Q^\#, W_Q^\#)$.

[14, Proposition 5.15] implies that being a cluster model is mutation-invariant. It follows that $(\widetilde{\Delta}_Q^\#, \widetilde{W}_Q^\#)$ is also a cluster model. In view of Remark 4.12, we can replace $(\widetilde{\Delta}_Q^\#, \widetilde{W}_Q^\#)$ by $(\Delta_Q^\#, W_Q^\#)$.

Proposition 6.6. *$(\Delta_Q^l, \mathcal{M}_Q^l; \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^l)$ and $(\Delta_Q^r, \mathcal{M}_Q^r; \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^r)$ are another two graded seeds for the cluster algebra $k[U]$. Moreover, if Q is trivially valued, both (Δ_Q^l, W_Q^l) and (Δ_Q^r, W_Q^r) are cluster models.*

Remark 6.7. Later we will also need a concrete description of $G(\Delta_Q^l, W_Q^l)$ and $G(\Delta_Q^r, W_Q^r)$. Both are given by lattice points in rational polyhedral cones. Recall that the three sets of defining conditions of the polyhedral cone $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2}$

$$\mathsf{g}H_u \geq 0,\ \mathsf{g}H_l \geq 0,\ \mathsf{g}H_r \geq 0.$$

We define the polyhedral cones $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^l} \subset \mathbb{R}^{(\Delta_Q^l)_0}$ and $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^r} \subset \mathbb{R}^{(\Delta_Q^l)_0}$ by the relations $\mathsf{g}H_l \geq 0$ and $\mathsf{g}H_r \geq 0$ respectively. Almost the same proof as Theorem 5.9 can show that $G(\Delta_Q^l, W_Q^l) = \mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^l} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{(\Delta_Q^l)_0}$ and $G(\Delta_Q^r, W_Q^r) = \mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^r} \cap \mathbb{Z}^{(\Delta_Q^r)_0}$.

7. A Short Review on the Work of Berenstein-Zelevinsky and Goncharov-Shen

In this short section, we briefly recall the work [6] and [27]. This section only serves as a historical review. It is independent of the rest of the paper. We believe that readers can benefit from reading it, but there is no harm to skip.

We first recall a classical result concerning tensor multiplicity (see eg. [40, Proposition 1.4]). Let us define linear operators L_i and R_i on $k[U]$ by

$$L_i\varphi(u) = \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=0}\varphi(x_i(t)u),\ R_i\varphi(u) = \frac{d}{dt}\Big|_{t=0}\varphi(ux_i(t)).$$

Proposition 7.1. *For any triple $(\mu,\nu,\lambda)\in\mathbb{Z}^{3n}_{\geqslant 0}$, we have that*

$$c^{\lambda}_{\mu\,\nu} = \dim\left\{\varphi\in k[U]_{\varpi(\mu+\nu-\lambda)} \mid L_i^{\mu(i)+1}\varphi = R_i^{\nu(i)+1}\varphi = 0 \text{ for } i\in Q_0\right\}.$$

Berenstein and Zelevinsky considered in [6] the dual picture $k[U]^*\cong U(\mathfrak{n})$. The operators L_i and R_i naturally live in the universal enveloping algebra $U(\mathfrak{n})$. Under this identification, the dual of the above space becomes the homogeneous component of degree $\varpi(\mu+\nu-\lambda)$ in the quotient

$$U(\mathfrak{n})\Big/\sum_{i\in Q_0}\left(e_i^{\mu(i)+1}U(\mathfrak{n}) + U(\mathfrak{n})e_i^{\nu(i)+1}\right).$$

Let $\mathcal{B}$ be Lusztig's canonical basis of the quantized enveloping algebra $U_q(\mathfrak{n})$ at $q=1$. It is known that any reduced word expression $\mathbf{i}$ for w_0 gives rise to a bijection $b_{\mathbf{i}}:\mathbb{Z}^{\ell(w_0)}_{\geqslant 0}\to\mathcal{B}$. Each element in $\mathcal{B}$ is homogeneous. Moreover, any subspace of form $e_i^nU(\mathfrak{n})$ is spanned by a subset of $\mathcal{B}$.

Proposition 7.2 ([6, Corollary 3.4])**.** *The number $c^{\lambda}_{\mu\,\nu}$ is equal to the number of vectors $b\in\mathcal{B}$ of degree $\varpi(\mu+\nu-\lambda)$ satisfying the following property: if $b = b_{\mathbf{i}}(t_1,\cdots,t_\ell)$, and $\mathbf{i}$ begins with i and ends with j, then $t_1\leq\mu(i)$ and $t_\ell\leq\nu(j^*)$.*

Berenstein and Zelevinsky further introduced the notion of $\mathbf{i}$-trails. The main results in [6] relate the tensor multiplicity $c^{\lambda}_{\mu\,\nu}$ to the number of lattice points in certain polytope defined explicitly in terms of $\mathbf{i}$-trails. Unfortunately, the polytopes are not very nice and in general $\mathbf{i}$-trails are hard to compute.

Using tropical geometry and geometric Satake, Goncharov and Shen reproved Proposition 7.2. Let $\mathbb{Z}^t$ be the tropical semifield with underlying set $\mathbb{Z}$ equipped with tropical addition and multiplication

$$a+_t b = \min\{a,b\},\ a\cdot_t b = a+b.$$

For the basic notion, eg., positive spaces and their tropical points, we refer readers to [27, Section 2.1]. Any positive morphism between positive spaces $f:X\to Y$ gives rise to the tropicalization denoted by $f^t:X(\mathbb{Z}^t)\to Y(\mathbb{Z}^t)$.

Fix a reduced word $\mathbf{i}=(i_\ell,\ldots,i_1)$ for w_0, and let $x = x_{i_\ell}(a_\ell)\cdots x_{i_1}(a_1)\in U$. There are positive functions $a_{\mathbf{i},j}:U\to\mathbb{A}^1,\ x\mapsto a_j$. Their tropicalizations induce an isomorphism

$$U(\mathbb{Z}^t)\cong\mathbb{Z}^\ell,\quad p\mapsto(a^t_{\mathbf{i},j}(p)).$$

Lusztig considered the character

$$\chi: U\to\mathbb{G}_a,\quad x\mapsto\sum_{j=1}^{\ell}a_j.$$

He proved [36] that the set of tropical points

$$U^+_\chi(\mathbb{Z}^t) := \{l\in U(\mathbb{Z}^t)\mid\chi^t(l)\geq 0\}$$

does not depend on $\mathbf{i}$, and parametrizes the canonical basis in the enveloping algebra of the Lie algebra of a maximal unipotent subgroup in the *Langlands dual* group G^L.

Let $\mathrm{Conf}_3 := (\mathcal{A}^\vee)^3/G$. In [17, 27], the authors defined several rational maps $p_1, p_2, p_3 : \mathrm{Conf}_3 \to U$ and $\pi_{1,2}, \pi_{2,3}, \pi_{3,1} : \mathrm{Conf}_3 \to H$. The map p_i's are related to each other through a cyclic shift of Conf_3 and similar for $\pi_{i,j}$'s. Both p_i and $\pi_{i,j}$ are positive so that they can be tropicalized. First of all, using the geometric Satake correspondence, they proved a more symmetric parametrization.

Theorem 7.3 ([27, Theorem 2.6 and (214)])**.** *The following set*

$$\left\{l \in \mathrm{Conf}_3(\mathbb{Z}^t) \mid p_i^t(l) \in U_\chi^+(\mathbb{Z}^t) \text{ for } i = 1,2,3 \text{ and } (\pi_{1,2}, \pi_{2,3}, \pi_{3,1})^t(l) = \varpi(\lambda,\mu,\nu)\right\}$$

parametrizes a basis in $(L(\lambda) \otimes L(\mu) \otimes L(\nu))^{G^L}$.

To reprove Proposition 7.2, we recall the notion of the left and right functions. We take $\mathbf{i}$ which starts from $i_1 = i$ (resp. ends by $i_\ell = i$), and define the "left" (resp. "right") functions:

$$\mathcal{L}_i(x) := a_1 \quad (\text{resp. } \mathcal{R}_i(x) := a_\ell).$$

They proved that the functions $\mathcal{L}_i$ and $\mathcal{R}_i$ are positive and related to the positive function χ as follows.

Lemma 7.4 ([27, Lemma 6.5])**.** *For any z generic in* Conf_3*, we have that*

$$\chi(p_3(z)) = \sum_{i \in Q_0} \frac{\alpha_i(\pi_{1,3}(z))}{\mathcal{L}_i(p_1(z))} = \sum_{i \in Q_0} \frac{\alpha_i(\pi_{2,3}(z))}{\mathcal{R}_i(p_2(z))}.$$

Using the tropical version of this lemma, we can reinterpret Theorem 7.3 as a version Langlands dual to Proposition 7.2.

Corollary 7.5 ([27, Theorem B.2])**.** *The tensor product multiplicity $c_{\mu\,\nu}^{\lambda}$ is equal to the cardinality of the set*

$$\left\{l \in U_\chi^+(\mathbb{Z}^t)_{\varpi(\mu+\nu-\lambda)} \mid \mathcal{L}_i^t(l) \le \mu(i^*), \mathcal{R}_i^t(l) \le \nu(i) \text{ for all } i \in Q_0\right\}.$$

In the procedure of proving our new parametrization, we will establish the following result similar to Theorem 7.3

$$k[\mathrm{Conf}_3] = \{s \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}) \mid i_a^*(s) \in k[U] \text{ for } a = 1,2,3\},$$

where $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S})$ is certain Laurent polynomial ring inside $k(\mathrm{Conf}_3)$, and each i_a is certain regular section of p_a. But instead of working with the tropical points, we will work with the g-vectors. Moreover, due to our construction in Part 1, it is more natural for us to work with $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1} := (\mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}^\vee)/G$ rather than Conf_3. Our elementary approach needs neither the geometric Satake nor Luzstig's canonical basis. What we heavily depend on is the cluster structure of $k[U]$ and a mutation interpretation of the twisted cyclic shift. We naturally get new parametrizations of $k[U]$ from the cluster structure and its quiver with potential models. Those parametrizations are the building blocks for our parametrization of $k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}]$.

8. Maps Relating Unipotent Groups

8.1. **Standard Maps.** Let $\mathrm{Conf}_{n,1} := (\mathcal{A}^n \times \mathcal{A}^\vee)/G$.

Lemma 8.1. *The coordinate ring $k[\mathrm{Conf}_{n,1}]$ is a normal unique factorization domain.*

Proof. The algebraic group G is clearly normal, then so is $\mathrm{Conf}_{n,1}$ by [38, Theorem 3.16]. It is well-known [31] that $k[G]$ is a UFD. Since the group U and G have no multiplicative characters, by [38, Theorem 3.17] $k[\mathrm{Conf}_{n,1}]$ is also a UFD. □

By the Bruhat decomposition, any pair $(A_1, A_0^\vee) \in \mathrm{Conf}_{1,1}$ has a representative $(U^- h\overline{w}, U)$ for some $h \in H, w \in W$. A pair $(A_1, A_0^\vee) \in \mathrm{Conf}_{1,1}$ is called *generic* if the $w \in W$ can be chosen as the identity. Let $\mathrm{Conf}^\circ_{n,1}$ be the open subset of $\mathrm{Conf}_{n,1}$ where each pair $(A_i, A_0^\vee)$ is generic (but we do not impose any condition among A_i's). By definition, we have an isomorphism $H \cong \mathrm{Conf}^\circ_{1,1}$. Let $\iota : H \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Conf}_{1,1}$ be the open embedding $h \mapsto (U^- h, U)$. For each $i \in Q_0$ we define the regular function $\widetilde{\varpi}_i$ on $\mathrm{Conf}_{1,1}$ by $\widetilde{\varpi}_i(U^- g_1, g_0 U) = m^{\varpi_i}(g_1 g_0)$. It is clear that the definition does not depend on the representatives. It follows from Proposition 6.1 that

Lemma 8.2. *$k[H]$ is exactly the localization of $k[\mathrm{Conf}_{1,1}]$ at all $\widetilde{\varpi}_i$.*

From now on, we will focus on the space $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$. Its coordinate ring has a triple-weight decomposition

$$k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}] = \bigoplus_{\mu,\nu,\lambda \in Z_{\geqslant 0}^{Q_0}} \left(L(\mu) \otimes L(\nu) \otimes L(\lambda)^\vee\right)^G.$$

We write very often $C^\lambda_{\mu,\nu}$ for the graded component $k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}]_{\mu,\nu,\lambda}$. It is clear that $c^\lambda_{\mu\,\nu} = \dim C^\lambda_{\mu,\nu}$.

We recall several rational maps defined in [17, 27]. Let $i : H \times H \times U \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$ be the open embedding

$$(h_1, h_2, u) \mapsto (U^- h_1, U^- h_2 u, U).$$

It is an embedding because the stabilizer of the generic pair $(U^- h, U)$ is 1_G. It is clear that the image of i is exactly $\mathrm{Conf}^\circ_{2,1}$. By restriction we get an embedding $i^* : k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}] \hookrightarrow k[H \times H \times U]$. We will view two H's and U as subgroups of $H \times H \times U$ in the natural way, and write i_1, i_2 and i_u for the restriction of i on first H, second H and U respectively. A function s in $C^\lambda_{\mu,\nu}$ is uniquely determined by its restriction $i_u^*(s)$ on U because

$$s(h_1, h_2, u) = h_1^{\varpi(\mu)} h_2^{\varpi(\nu)} s(u) \quad \text{for } (h_1, h_2, u) \in H \times H \times U. \tag{8.1}$$

So i^* embeds $C^\lambda_{\mu,\nu}$ into $k[U]$ (in fact into $k[U]_{\varpi(\mu+\nu-\lambda)}$ by easy calculation). We note that each $C^\lambda_{\mu,\nu}$ is *not* disjoint under this embedding.

Lemma 8.3. *For any $f \in \mathrm{ind}(C^2 Q)$, the generalized minor m_f spans the space*

$$\left\{ \varphi \in k[U]_{\varpi(\mathsf{e}(f)-\mathsf{f})} \mid L_i^{\mathsf{e}(f)(i)+1} \varphi = R_i^{\mathsf{f}_-(i)+1} \varphi = 0 \text{ for } i \in Q_0 \right\}.$$

In particular, $c^{\mathsf{f}_+}_{\mathsf{e}(f),\mathsf{f}_-} = 1$.

Proof. For each $\varphi \in k[U]$, the coefficient of each t^n in $\varphi(x_i(t))$ is equal to $R_i^n \varphi(1_G)/n!$. If φ is homogeneous of degree γ, then $\varphi(1_G)$ can be nonzero only if $\gamma = 0$. It follows that $\varphi(x_i(t))$ contains only t^n with $n\alpha_i = \gamma$. So for $\gamma = \varpi(\mathsf{e}(f) - \mathsf{f})$

$$R_i^{\mathsf{f}_-(i)+1} \varphi = 0 \text{ if and only if } (\mathsf{f}_-(i)+1) c_i \neq \mathsf{e}(f) - \mathsf{f},$$

where c_i is the i-th column of the Cartan matrix $C(G)$. Since $\mathsf{e}(f)(i) \leq 1$ and $c_i(i) = 2$, we can never have $(\mathsf{e}(f) + \mathsf{f}_- - \mathsf{f}_+)(i) = (\mathsf{f}_-(i)+1) c_i(i)$. So we proved that $R_i^{\mathsf{f}_-(i)+1} m_f = 0$ for $i \in Q_0$.

Suppose that $m_f = m_{e,w}^{\varpi_j}$. By construction, we have that $m_f \in L(\mathsf{e}_j)_{w(\varpi_j)} \subset U^-\backslash G$, so $L_i m_f = 0$ for any $i \in Q_0$. The generalized minor m_f spans the space because $\dim L(\mathsf{e}_j)_{w(\varpi_j)} = \dim L(\mathsf{e}_j)_{\varpi_j} = 1$. □

We recall that each $m_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}$ is a principal minor, which evaluates to 1 on U; and now we set $m_{\mathrm{Id}_i} = 1$.

Lemma-Definition 8.4. *For any $f \in \mathrm{ind}(C^2Q)$, there is a unique function $s_f \in k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}]_{\mathsf{e}(f),\mathsf{f}_-,\mathsf{f}_+}$ such that*

$$i_u^*(s_f) = m_f.$$

Moreover, $s \in C^\lambda_{\mu,\nu}$ satisfies $i_u^*(s) = 1$ if and only if $s = s_+^\mu s_0^\nu$, where $s_+^\mu := \prod_i s_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}^{\mu(i)}$ and $s_0^\nu := \prod_i s_{\mathrm{Id}_i}^{\nu(i)}$.

Proof. The first statement follows from Proposition 7.1 and Lemma 8.3. For the last statement, it suffices to prove the "only if" part. If $i_u^*(s) = 1$, then $\mu + \nu = \lambda$ because $i_u^*(s)$ has degree $\varpi(\mu + \nu - \lambda)$. It is clear that $c_{\mu,\nu}^{\mu+\nu} = 1$ (consider tensoring the highest weight vectors of $L(\mu)$ and $L(\nu)$), but $s_+^\mu s_0^\nu$ also has degree $(\mu, \nu, \mu+\nu)$, so $s = s_+^\mu s_0^\nu$. □

Remark 8.5. For Q of type A, the analogous map i^* was also considered in a quiver-invariant theory setting (see [14, Example 3.10, 3.12]). In that setting, the map comes from a semi-orthogonal decomposition of the module category of a triple flag quiver.

Corollary 8.6. *For each $f \in \mathrm{ind}(C^2Q)$, s_f is irreducible in $k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}]$.*

Proof. It is clear that the zero-degree component of $k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}]$ is k. If f is positive or neutral, then the degree of f is obviously indecomposable. The same argument as in [14, Lemma 1.8] shows that s_f is irreducible.

We remain to consider the case when f is the minimal presentation of a general representation. It is known that all generalized minors m_f are irreducible in $k[U]$. Suppose that s_f factors as $s_f = s_1 s_2$, then $i_u^*(s_f) = i_u^*(s_1) i_u^*(s_2) = m_f$. So one of them, say $i_u^*(s_1)$, has to be a unit. According to Lemma 8.4, s_1 is a polynomial in $s_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}$'s and s_{Id_i}'s. So there is a homogenous component s_2' of s_2 and some μ and ν such that $s_2' s_+^\mu s_0^\nu$ has the same degree as s_f, i.e., $s_2' s_+^\mu s_0^\nu \in C^{\mathsf{f}_+}_{\mathsf{e}(f),\mathsf{f}_-}$. Since f is a minimal presentation of a general representation, we must have $\nu = 0$. If μ is nonzero, then we must have $\mu = \mathsf{e}(f)$. Then the weight of s_2' is $(0, \mathsf{f}_-, \mathsf{f}_+ - \mathsf{e}(f))$, and f_- has to be equal to $\mathsf{f}_+ - \mathsf{e}(f)$. But i_u^* embeds $C^{\mathsf{f}_+}_{\mathsf{e}(f),\mathsf{f}_-}$ into $k[U]_{\mathsf{e}(f)-\mathsf{f}}$. Since f is not positive or neutral, $\mathsf{e}(f) \neq \mathsf{f}$, which is a contradiction. □

Let p be a rational inverse of i, which is regular on $\mathrm{Conf}^\circ_{2,1} = i(H \times H \times U)$. Let p_1, p_2 and p_u be the composition of p with the natural projection to first H, second H, and U respectively.

Corollary 8.7. *On the open subset $\mathrm{Conf}^\circ_{2,1} \subset \mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$*

$$p_u^*(m_f) = s_f \left(s_+^{\mathsf{e}(f)} s_0^{\mathsf{f}_-} \right)^{-1},$$
$$p_1^*(\varpi_i) = s_{\mathrm{O}_i^+},\ p_2^*(\varpi_i) = s_{\mathrm{Id}_i}.$$

for any indecomposable presentation f.

Proof. They follow from straightforward calculation

$$(p_u^* m_f)\left(i(h_1,h_2,u)\right) = m_f\left(p_u i(h_1,h_2,u)\right) = m_f(u);$$

$$s_f(i(h_1,h_2,u)) = h_1^{\varpi(\mathsf{e}(f))} h_2^{\varpi(\mathsf{f}_-)} m_f(u),\ (s_+^{\mathsf{e}(f)} s_0^{\mathsf{f}_-})(i(h_1,h_2,u)) = h_1^{\varpi(\mathsf{e}(f))} h_2^{\varpi(\mathsf{f}_-)}.$$

The statement for p_1^*, p_2^* is rather obvious. For example,

$$s_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}(i(h_1,h_2,u)) = h_1^{\varpi_i} h_2^0 i_u^*(s_{\mathrm{O}_i^+})(u) = h_1^{\varpi_i} = p_1^*(\varpi_i)\left(i(h_1,h_2,u)\right).$$

□

Corollary 8.8. *The localization of $k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}]$ at all s_f's for f positive and neutral is exactly $k[H \times H \times U]$.*

Proof. Let $\widetilde{p}_1$ and $\widetilde{p}_2$ be the natural projections $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1} \to \mathrm{Conf}_{1,1}$ given by $(A_1, A_2, A_0^\vee) \mapsto (A_1, A_0^\vee)$ and $(A_1, A_2, A_0^\vee) \mapsto (A_2, A_0^\vee)$. Then $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}^\circ$ is the intersection $\widetilde{p}_1^{-1}(\mathrm{Conf}_{1,1}^\circ) \cap \widetilde{p}_2^{-1}(\mathrm{Conf}_{1,1}^\circ)$. It suffices to show that $\widetilde{p}_1^*(\widetilde{\varpi}_i) = s_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}$ and $\widetilde{p}_2^*(\widetilde{\varpi}_i) = s_{\mathrm{Id}_i}$. The map ιp_i agrees with $\widetilde{p}_i$ on a dense subset of $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$ for $i = 1, 2$. So $\widetilde{p}_1^*(\widetilde{\varpi}_i) = p_1^* \iota^*(\widetilde{\varpi}_i) = p_1^*(\varpi_i) = s_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}$ and $\widetilde{p}_2^*(\widetilde{\varpi}_i) = p_2^* \iota^*(\widetilde{\varpi}_i) = p_2^*(\varpi_i) = s_{\mathrm{Id}_i}$. □

Corollary 8.9. *The set of functions $\mathcal{S}_Q^2 := \{s_f\}_{f \in \mathrm{ind}(C^2Q)}$ is algebraically independent over the base field k.*

Proof. Since the map $p : \mathrm{Conf}_{2,1} \to H \times H \times U$ is birational, the pullbacks of (two copies of) $\varpi_i \in H$ and $m_f \in U$ are algebraically independent. We have seen that up to a factor of some monomial in $s_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}, s_{\mathrm{Id}_i} \in \mathcal{S}_Q^2$, they are exactly the functions in $\mathcal{S}_Q^2$. Our claim follows. □

Suppose that f as above is mutable. Let m'_f be a function in $k[U]$ in the exchange relation

$$m_f m'_f = \prod_{g \rightarrowtail f} m_g + \prod_{f \rightarrowtail h} m_h. \tag{8.2}$$

Let $(\mu', \nu', \lambda') = \sum_{f \rightarrowtail h} (\mathsf{e}(h), \mathsf{h}_-, \mathsf{h}_+) - (\mathsf{e}(f), \mathsf{f}_-, \mathsf{f}_+)$.

Lemma 8.10. *The function $s'_f := p_u^*(m'_f) s_+^{\mu'} s_0^{\nu'}$ is regular on $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$ satisfying $i_u^*(s'_f) = m'_f$ and the exchange relation*

$$s_f s'_f = \prod_{g \rightarrowtail f} s_g + \prod_{f \rightarrowtail h} s_h.$$

Moreover, s'_f and s_f are relatively prime in $k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}]$.

Proof. Since i is a regular section of p, we have that $i_u^*(s'_f) = m'_f$ and s'_f is regular on $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}^\circ = i(H \times H \times U)$. We pull back (8.2) through p_u, and multiply $s_+^{\mu'} s_0^{\nu'}$ on both sides. Then we get from Corollary 8.7 that

$$s_f \left(p_u^*(m'_f) s_+^{\mu'} s_0^{\nu'} \right) = \prod_{g \rightarrowtail f} s_g + \prod_{f \rightarrowtail h} s_h. \tag{8.3}$$

We remain to show that s'_f is in fact regular on whole $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$. By (8.3), the locus of indeterminacy of s'_f is contained in the zero locus $Z(s_f)$ of s_f. Since $s_f \mid_U = m_f$, the intersection of $Z(s_f)$ and $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}^\circ$ is nonempty. In other words, $Z(s_f)$ is not contained in the complement of $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}^\circ$. Since $Z(s_f)$ is irreducible (Corollary 8.6), we conclude that s'_f is regular outside a codimension 2 subvariety of $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$. Since

$\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$ is normal (Lemma 8.1), by the algebraic Hartogs s'_f is a regular function on $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$.

For the last statement, we suppose the contrary. Since s_f is irreducible, s_f is then a factor of s'_f. But this is clearly impossible by comparing the first component of their triple-weight. □

8.2. **Twisted Maps.** Let $\vee$ (written exponentially) be the morphism $U^-\backslash G \to G/U$ given by $(U^-g)^\vee \mapsto g^T U$. Let l be the twisted cyclic shift on $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$:

$$(A_1, A_2, A_3^\vee) \mapsto (A_2, A_3\overline{w_0}, (A_1\overline{w_0})^\vee).$$

We have that

$$l^2(A_1, A_2, A_3^\vee) = (A_3\overline{w_0}, A_1\overline{w_0}^2, (A_2\overline{w_0})^\vee),$$

and l^3 is the identity. We define $i_l := li_u : U \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$, that is

$$u \mapsto (U^-u, U^-\overline{w_0}, \overline{w_0}^T U).$$

We write r for l^2. Similarly we denote $i_r := ri_u : U \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$.



It turns out that the twisted cyclic shift is also related to the sequence $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l$ of mutations considered in Section 6.3. We will see in Theorem B.14 that $l^*(s_f) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_l(s_f)$ for f mutable. Moreover, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l(\Delta_Q^2) = \pi^2(\Delta_Q^2)$, where π^2 is a relabelling of frozen vertices of Δ_Q^2.

Lemma 8.11. *We have the following*

$$i_l^*(s_f) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_l(m_f),\ i_r^*(s_f) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_r(m_f) \quad \textit{for } f \textit{ mutable};$$
$$i_l^*(s_{\mathrm{Id}_i}) = m_{\mathrm{O}_{i^*}^-},\ i_l^*(s_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}) = i_l^*(s_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}) = 1;$$
$$i_r^*(s_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}) = m_{\mathrm{O}_i^-},\ i_r^*(s_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}) = i_r^*(s_{\mathrm{Id}_i}) = 1.$$

Proof. First consider the case when f is mutable, then l^* is given by a sequence of mutations $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l$. The pullback i_u^* clearly commutes with any sequence of mutations, so by Lemma 8.4

$$i_l^*(s_f) = i_u^* l^*(s_f) = i_u^*(\boldsymbol{\mu}_l(s_f)) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_l(i_u^*(s_f)) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_l(m_f).$$

For f frozen, by Lemma 8.4 we have that

$$i_l^*(s_{\mathrm{Id}_i}) = i_u^*(s_{\mathrm{O}_{i^*}^-}) = m_{\mathrm{O}_{i^*}^-},\ i_l^*(s_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}) = i_u^*(s_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}) = 1,\ i_l^*(s_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}) = i_u^*(s_{\mathrm{Id}_{i^*}}) = 1.$$

The argument for i_r^* is similar. □

We set $\Delta_Q^u := \Delta_Q$ and $\mathcal{M}_Q^u := \mathcal{M}_Q$. We define three linear natural projections $\mathsf{i}_\#^* : \mathbb{R}^{(\Delta_Q^2)_0} \to \mathbb{R}^{(\Delta_Q^\#)_0}$ for $\# \in \{u, l, r\}$, where i_u^* (resp. i_l^*; i_r^*) forgets the coordinates corresponding to the neutral and positive (resp. positive and negative; negative and neutral) frozen vertices.

Recall the definition of the g-vector with respect to a pair $(\Delta, \mathbf{x})$ as in Section 1.3. Let $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}_Q^2)$ be the Laurent polynomial ring in $\mathcal{S}_Q^2$. Note that $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}_Q^2)$ has a basis parameterized by all possible g-vectors (with respect to $(\Delta_Q^2, \mathcal{S}_Q^2)$), which can be identified with $\mathbb{Z}^{(\Delta_Q^2)_0}$.

Lemma 8.12. *If $s \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}_Q^2) \subset k(\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1})$ has a well-defined g-vector g with respect to $(\Delta_Q^2, \mathcal{S}_Q^2)$, then so is the g-vectors of $i_\#^*(s)$ with respect to $(\Delta_Q^\#, \mathcal{M}_Q^\#)$, which is equal to $\mathsf{i}_\#^*(\mathsf{g})$ for $\# \in \{u, l, r\}$.*

Proof. We will only prove the statement for i_l because the argument for the other two is similar. Suppose that $s = \mathbf{x}^{\mathsf{g}} F(\mathbf{y})$ where $\mathbf{x}(f) = s_f$ and $\mathbf{y}$ is as in Section 1.3. We have seen in Lemma 8.11 that $i_l^*(s_f) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_l(m_f) = \mathcal{M}_Q^l(f)$ if f is not negative or positive. If f is negative or positive, then $i_l^*(s_f) = 1$ so $i_l^*(\mathbf{x}^{\mathsf{g}}) = (\mathbf{x}_l)^{\mathsf{i}_l^*(\mathsf{g})}$ where $\mathbf{x}_l(f) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_l(m_f)$. Recall that the quiver Δ_Q^l is obtained from Δ_Q^2 by deleting the negative and positive frozen vertices. According to this description, we have that $i_l^*(\mathbf{y}(f)) = i_l^*(\mathbf{x}^{-b_f}) = \mathbf{x}_l^{-b_f^l} = \mathbf{y}_l(f)$, where b_f (resp. b_f^l) is the row of $B_{\Delta_Q^2}$ (resp. $B_{\Delta_Q^l}$) corresponding to f. Hence, we get $i_l^*(s) = (\mathbf{x}_l)^{\mathsf{i}_l^*(\mathsf{g})} F(\mathbf{y}_l)$. □

Lemma 8.13. *The polytope $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2}(\mu, \nu, \lambda)$ has lattice points no less than $c_{\mu\,\nu}^{\lambda}$.*

Proof. By Corollary 8.8, we have that $k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}] \subset \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}_Q^2)$. Since $i_u,\ i_l,\ i_r$ are all regular, we trivially have that

$$k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}] \subseteq \left\{ s \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}_Q^2) \mid i_\#^*(s) \in k[U] \text{ for } \# = u, l, r \right\}. \tag{8.4}$$

If $s \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{S}_Q^2)$ has a well-defined g-vector, then by the previous lemma the g-vector of $i_\#^*(s)$ is equal to $\mathsf{i}_\#^*(\mathsf{g})$. So if $i_\#^*(s) \in k[U]$, then $\mathsf{i}_\#^*(\mathsf{g}) \in \mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^\#}$ by Lemma 1.9, Proposition 5.13, 6.6 and Remark 6.7.

Due to (8.4), it suffices to show that the lattice points in $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2}(\mu, \nu, \lambda)$ can be identified with points $\mathsf{g} \in \mathbb{Z}^{(\Delta_Q^2)_0}$ of weight (μ, ν, λ) such that $\mathsf{i}_\#^*(\mathsf{g}) \in \mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^\#}$ for $\# \in \{u, l, r\}$. But this follows from the description of the cones $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2}$, G_{Δ_Q}, $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^l}$ and $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^r}$ (Theorem 5.9, Proposition 5.13, and Remark 6.7). □

9. Cluster Structure on $k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}]$

Theorem 9.1. *Suppose that Q is trivially valued. Then the coordinate ring of $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$ is the graded upper cluster algebra $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_Q^2, \mathcal{S}_Q^2; \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^2)$. Moreover, (Δ_Q^2, W_Q^2) is a cluster model. In particular, $c_{\mu\,\nu}^{\lambda}$ is counted by lattice points in $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2}(\mu, \nu, \lambda)$.*

Proof. By Lemma 8.9 and Corollary 3.13, $(\Delta_Q^2, \mathcal{S}_Q^2; \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^2)$ form a graded seed. Due to Lemma 8.10 and Corollary 8.6, we can apply Lemma 1.8 to conclude that $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_Q^2, \mathcal{S}_Q^2; \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^2)$ is a graded subalgebra of $k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}]$.

By Theorem 4.10, $C_W\left(\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2}(\mu, \nu, \lambda) \cap \mathbb{Z}^{(\Delta_Q^2)_0}\right)$ is a linearly independent set in $C_{\mu,\nu}^{\lambda}$ for any triple weights. But Lemma 8.13 says that the cardinality of $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta_Q^2}(\mu, \nu, \lambda) \cap \mathbb{Z}^{(\Delta_Q^2)_0}$ is at least $c_{\mu\,\nu}^{\lambda}$. So they actually span the vector space $C_{\mu,\nu}^{\lambda}$. We conclude that $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_Q^2, \mathcal{S}_Q^2; \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^2)$ is equal to $k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}]$, and (Δ_Q^2, W_Q^2) is a cluster model. □

It follows that (8.4) is in fact an equality. The proof shows that $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_Q^2, \mathcal{S}_Q^2; \boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^2)$ is a graded subalgebra of $k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}]$ no matter if Q is trivially valued.

Conjecture 9.2. The first and last statement of Theorem 9.1 is true even if Q is not trivially valued.

We illustrate by example that in general the upper cluster algebra $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_Q^2)$ strictly contains the cluster algebra $\mathcal{C}(\Delta_Q^2)$.

Example 9.3. Let Q be of type D_4 as in Example 3.8. It can be checked by the 44 inequalities in Example 5.10 that $\mathsf{g} = \mathsf{e}_{34,12} - \mathsf{e}_{34,1} + \mathsf{e}_{2,0}$ (in weight labelling) is μ-supported. Its triple weights is $(\mathsf{e}_2, \mathsf{e}_2, \mathsf{e}_2)$, and moreover $c^{\mathsf{e}_2}_{\mathsf{e}_2,\mathsf{e}_2} = 1$. This is clearly an extremal weight. So it suffices to show that no cluster variable has this g-vector. For this, we need a result in [10], which says that the g-vector of a cluster variable is a g-vector of a *rigid* presentation in the Jacobian algebra. The rigidity is characterized by the vanishing of the E-invariant introduced in [13, 10]. It is not hard to show that $\mathrm{E}(f, f) := \mathrm{Hom}_{K^b(J)}(f, f[1]) \neq 0$ where f is a general presentation in $\mathrm{Hom}_J(P([\mathsf{g}]_+), P([\mathsf{g}]_-))$.

10. Epilogue

10.1. **Cluster Structure of Base Affine Spaces.** We denote the ice quiver obtained from Δ_Q^2 by deleting neutral frozen vertices by $\Delta_Q^\sharp$. Let $\mathcal{M}_Q^\sharp := \{m_f\}_{f \in (\Delta_Q^\sharp)_0}$. We define the weight configuration $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^\sharp$ on $\Delta_Q^\sharp$ by $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^\sharp(f) = (\mathsf{e}(f), \mathsf{f})$. Recall from Lemma 6.2 that the degree of m_f is $\varpi(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^\sharp(f))$. As a side result, we will show that the coordinate ring of the base affine space $\mathcal{A} := U^-\backslash G$ is the graded upper cluster algebra $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_Q^\sharp, \mathcal{M}_Q^\sharp; \varpi(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^\sharp))$.

The proof is similar to but easier than that for $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$ so our treatment may be a little sketchy. Recall the open set $G_0 = U^- H U$ of G. We have an open embedding

$$\iota_0 : H \times U = U^-\backslash G_0 \hookrightarrow U^-\backslash G.$$

The localization of $k[\mathcal{A}]$ at all m_f's for f positive is exactly $k[H \times U]$. In particular, $k[\mathcal{A}]$ is contained in the Laurent polynomial ring in $\mathcal{M}_Q^\sharp$. Consider the open embedding

$$\iota = (\iota_1, \iota_2) : H \times \mathcal{A} \hookrightarrow \mathrm{Conf}_{2,1},\ (h, U^- g) \mapsto (U^- h, U^- g, U).$$

Note that the map $\iota(\mathrm{Id}_H, \iota_0) : H \times H \times U \to \mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$ is the map i defined in Section 8.1. Let p be a rational inverse of ι, and p_2 be the map p followed by the second component projection. We define the birational map $r' : U^-\backslash G \to U^-\backslash G$ to be the composition $r' := p_2 r \iota_2$. The map r' can be viewed as a variation of Fomin-Zelevinsky's *twist automorphism* [20] on the big cell $U^-\backslash G_0$. Readers can check that they differ by a (fibrewise) rescaling along the toric fibre of $H \times U$, but we do not need this fact.

Let $i_{u'} := \iota_0 \mid_U$, and $i_{r'} := r' i_{u'}$. Then we have the following commutative diagram. The map $i_{r'}$ is in fact regular because r' is regular on the image of $i_{u'}$.



To finish the proof, we only need three maps $i_{u'}$, $i_{r'}$ and r'. Analogous to Theorem B.14, we have that the pullback $(r')^*$ is related to the sequence of mutations $\boldsymbol{\mu}_r$. More precisely, we have that

$$\boldsymbol{\mu}_r(m_f) = (r')^*(m_f) \text{ for any } f \text{ mutable.}$$

So analogous to Lemma 8.11, we have that $i^*_{r'}(m_f) = (r')^*(m_f) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_r(m_f)$ for f mutable. Obviously we also have that $i^*_{r'}(m_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}) = m_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}$ and $i^*_{r'}(m_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}) = 1$.

Analogous to i^*_u and i^*_r, we have the maps $\mathsf{i}^*_{u'} : \mathbb{R}^{(\Delta^\sharp_Q)_0} \to \mathbb{R}^{(\Delta_Q)_0}$ and $\mathsf{i}^*_{r'} : \mathbb{R}^{(\Delta^\sharp_Q)_0} \to \mathbb{R}^{(\Delta^r_Q)_0}$. The map $\mathsf{i}^*_{u'}$ (resp. $\mathsf{i}^*_{r'}$) forgets the coordinates corresponding to the positive (resp. negative) frozen vertices. We have the following analog of Lemma 8.12. If $m \in \mathcal{A}$ has a well-defined g-vector g with respect to $(\mathcal{M}^\sharp_Q, \Delta^\sharp_Q)$, then so are the g-vectors of $i^*_{u'}(m)$ and $i^*_{r'}(m)$ with respect to $(\mathcal{M}_Q, \Delta_Q)$ and $(\mathcal{M}^r_Q, \Delta^r_Q)$. They are equal to $\mathsf{i}^*_{u'}(\mathsf{g})$ and $\mathsf{i}^*_{r'}(\mathsf{g})$ respectively.

We restrict the iARt QP (Δ^2_Q, W^2_Q) to the subquiver $\Delta^\sharp_Q$. We denote the restricted potential by $W^\sharp_Q$. Almost the same proof as in Theorem 5.9 shows that the set $G(\Delta^\sharp_Q, W^\sharp_Q)$ of μ-supported g-vectors are given by the lattice points in the polyhedral cone $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta^\sharp_Q}$. The cone is defined by the two sets of defining conditions of $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta^2_Q}$, namely, $\mathsf{g}H_u \geq 0$ and $\mathsf{g}H_r \geq 0$. By almost the same argument, we get the following analog of Lemma 8.13. For the weight configuration $\varpi(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\sharp_Q)$ we define the polytope $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta^\sharp_Q}(\mu, \lambda)$ as in Definition 5.14.

Lemma 10.1. *The polytope $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta^\sharp_Q}(\mu, \lambda)$ has lattice points no less than $\dim k[\mathcal{A}]_{\mu,\lambda}$.*

Theorem 10.2. *Suppose that Q is trivially valued. Then the coordinate ring of $\mathcal{A}$ is the graded upper cluster algebra $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta^\sharp_Q, \mathcal{M}^\sharp_Q; \varpi(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\sharp_Q))$. Moreover, $(\Delta^\sharp_Q, W^\sharp_Q)$ is a cluster model. In particular, the weight multiplicity $\dim L(\mu)_{\varpi(\lambda)}$ is counted by lattice points in $\mathsf{G}_{\Delta^\sharp_Q}(\mu, \lambda)$.*

Proof. We know from [7] that $(\Delta^\sharp_Q, \mathcal{M}^\sharp_Q)$ is a seed satisfying the condition of Lemma 1.8. By Lemma 1.8, $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta^\sharp_Q, \mathcal{M}^\sharp_Q; \varpi(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\sharp_Q))$ is a graded subalgebra of $k[\mathcal{A}]$.

By Theorem 4.10, $C_W\left(\mathsf{G}_{\Delta^\sharp_Q}(\mu, \lambda) \cap \mathbb{Z}^{(\Delta^\sharp_Q)_0}\right)$ is a linearly independent set in $k[\mathcal{A}]_{\mu,\lambda}$ for any μ, λ. But Lemma 10.1 implies that they actually span the vector space $k[\mathcal{A}]_{\mu,\lambda}$. We conclude that $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta^\sharp_Q, \mathcal{M}^\sharp_Q; \varpi(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^\sharp_Q))$ is equal to $k[\mathcal{A}]$, and $(\Delta^\sharp_Q, W^\sharp_Q)$ is a cluster model. □

Remark 10.3. For Q of type A, the theorem was proved in [15, Example 3.10] using the technique of projection. The map p_2 is induced from a semi-orthogonal decomposition of the module category of a triple flag quiver.

In general, the cluster algebra $\mathcal{C}(\Delta_Q^\sharp)$ is also strictly contained in its upper cluster algebra. The example is still given by the Q of type D_4. We take the same g-vector as in Example 9.3.

Remark 10.4. Let $K^2Q := K^2(\text{proj-}Q)$ be the homotopy category of C^2Q as in [10]. Then the ice quiver $\Delta_Q^\sharp$ can be obtained from the ARt quiver $\Delta(K^2Q)$ by freezing the negative and positive vertices.

There are two other seeds mutation equivalent to this seed via $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_r$. Their quivers are obtained from Δ_Q^2 by deleting the positive and negative frozen vertices respectively.

10.2. **Remark on the Non-simply Laced Cases.** Suppose that G is not simply laced, or equivalently Q is not trivially valued. To prove Conjecture 9.2, let us exam the arguments in proving Theorem 9.1. We find that there are two missing ingredients. One is the straightforward generalization of Theorem B.14, and the other is an analogous cluster character for species with potentials. Although the proof of Theorem B.14 depends on a result involving preprojective algebras, the author has a much longer proof for all cases using only a conjectural generalization of Lemma B.3 to the species with potentials. For the missing cluster character, as proved in [14] for the usual QPs, the existence of such a map to the upper cluster algebra is also equivalent to Lemma B.3. The argument there can be generalized. So the upshot is that the only missing part for Conjecture 9.2 is certain generalization of Lemma B.3. We expect that such a result will appear in the subsequent paper of [34].

B. The Twisted Cyclic Shift via Mutations

B.1. **Mutation of Representations, g-vectors, and F-polynomials.** We review some material from [13]. Let (Δ, W) be a QP as in Section 4.1. The *mutation* μ_u of (Δ, W) at a vertex u is defined as follows. The first step is to define the following new QP $\widetilde{\mu}_u(\Delta, W) = (\widetilde{\Delta}, \widetilde{W})$. We put $\widetilde{\Delta}_0 = \Delta_0$ and $\widetilde{\Delta}_1$ is the union of three different kinds

- all arrows of Δ not incident to u,
- a composite arrow $[ab]$ from $t(a)$ to $h(b)$ for each a, b with $h(a) = t(b) = u$,
- an opposite arrow a^* (resp. b^*) for each incoming arrow a (resp. outgoing arrow b) at u.

Note that this $\widetilde{\Delta}$ is the result of first two steps in Definition 1.3. The new potential on $\widetilde{\Delta}$ is given by

$$\widetilde{W} := [W] + \sum_{h(a)=t(b)=u} b^* a^* [ab],$$

where $[W]$ is obtained by substituting $[ab]$ for each words ab occurring in W. Finally we define $(\Delta', W') = \mu_u(\Delta, W)$ as the *reduced part* ([12, Definition 4.13]) of $(\widetilde{\Delta}, \widetilde{W})$. For this last step, we refer readers to [12, Section 4,5] for details.

Now we start to define the mutation of decorated representations of (Δ, W). Consider the resolution of the simple module S_u

$$\cdots \to \bigoplus_{h(a)=u} P_{t(a)} \xrightarrow{a(\partial_{[ab]})_b} \bigoplus_{t(b)=u} P_{h(b)} \xrightarrow{b(b)} P_u \to S_u \to 0, \tag{B.1}$$

$$0 \to S_u \to I_u \xrightarrow{(a)_a} \bigoplus_{h(a)=u} I_{t(a)} \xrightarrow{a(\partial_{[ab]})_b} \bigoplus_{t(b)=u} I_{h(b)} \to \cdots, \tag{B.2}$$

where I_u is the indecomposable injective representation of $J(\Delta, W)$ corresponding to a vertex u. We thus have the triangle of linear maps with $\beta_u\gamma_u = 0$ and $\gamma_u\alpha_u = 0$.



We first define a decorated representation $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}} = (\widetilde{M}, \widetilde{M}^+)$ of $\widetilde{\mu}_u(\Delta, W)$. We set

$$\widetilde{M}(v) = M(v), \quad \widetilde{M}^+(v) = M^+(v) \quad (v \neq u);$$
$$\widetilde{M}(u) = \frac{\operatorname{Ker}\gamma_u}{\operatorname{Im}\beta_u} \oplus \operatorname{Im}\gamma_u \oplus \frac{\operatorname{Ker}\alpha_u}{\operatorname{Im}\gamma_u} \oplus M^+(u), \quad \widetilde{M}^+(u) = \frac{\operatorname{Ker}\beta_u}{\operatorname{Ker}\beta_u \cap \operatorname{Im}\alpha_u}.$$

We then set $\widetilde{M}(a) = M(a)$ for all arrows not incident to u, and $\widetilde{M}([ab]) = M(ab)$. It is defined in [12] a choice of linear maps $\widetilde{M}(a^*), \widetilde{M}(b^*)$ making $\widetilde{M}$ a representation of $(\widetilde{\Delta}, \widetilde{W})$. We refer readers to [13, Section 10] for details. Finally, we define $\mathcal{M}' = \mu_u(\mathcal{M})$ to be the *reduced part* ([12, Definition 10.4]) of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}$.

Recall the g-vector form Definition 4.2. We can also define the dual g-vectors using the injective presentations. Let M be a representation of $J(\Delta, W)$ with minimal injective presentation $0 \to M \to I(\beta_-^\vee) \to I(\beta_+^\vee)$, then the *dual* g*-vector* $\mathsf{g}^\vee(M)$ of M is the reduced weight vector $\mathsf{g}^\vee = \beta_+^\vee - \beta_-^\vee$. The definition can also be extended to all decorated representations similar to g-vectors.

Recall the y-variables $y_u = \mathbf{x}^{-b_u}$ as in Section 1.3. The seed mutation of Definition 1.4 induces the $\mathbf{y}$*-seed mutation*. We recall the mutation rule [22, (3.8)]. Let $(\mathbf{y}', \Delta') := \mu_u(\mathbf{y}, \Delta)$ and $B(\Delta) = (b_{u,v})$, then $\Delta' = \mu_u(\Delta)$ and

$$y'_v = \begin{cases} y_u^{-1} & \text{if } v = u; \\ y_v y_u^{[-b_{u,v}]_+}(y_u + 1)^{b_{u,v}} & \text{if } v \neq u. \end{cases} \tag{B.3}$$

Definition B.1 ([13])**.** We define the dual F-polynomial of a representation M by

$$F_M^\vee(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\mathsf{e}} \chi(\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathsf{e}}(M))\mathbf{y}^{\mathsf{e}}, \tag{B.4}$$

where $\mathrm{Gr}_{\mathsf{e}}(M)$ is the variety parameterizing e-dimensional subrepresentations of M.

Remark B.2. The F-polynomial of M is $F_M(\mathbf{y}) = \sum_{\mathsf{e}} \chi(\mathrm{Gr}^{\mathsf{e}}(M))\mathbf{y}^{\mathsf{e}}$. We only need the dual version in B.3. Our dual g-vector and dual F-polynomial is the g-vector and F-polynomial in [22, 13].

Here is the key Lemma in [13].

Lemma B.3. *Let $\mathcal{M}$ be an arbitrary representation of a nondegenerate QP (Δ, W), and let $\mathcal{M}' = \mu_u(\mathcal{M})$, then*

(1) *The F-polynomials of M and M' are related by*

$$(y_u+1)^{-\beta_-^\vee(u)}F_M^\vee(\mathbf{y})=(y'_u+1)^{-(\beta_-^\vee)'(u)}F_{M'}^\vee(\mathbf{y}'). \tag{B.5}$$

(2) *The g-vector and $\mathsf{g}^\vee$-vector of $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}'$ are related by*

$$\mathsf{g}'(v)=\begin{cases}-\mathsf{g}(u) & \text{if } u=v;\\ \mathsf{g}(v)+[b_{v,u}]_+\mathsf{g}(u)+b_{v,u}\beta_-(u) & \text{if } u\neq v,\end{cases} \tag{B.6}$$

$$(\mathsf{g}^\vee)'(v)=\begin{cases}-\mathsf{g}^\vee(u) & \text{if } u=v;\\ \mathsf{g}^\vee(v)+[-b_{v,u}]_+\mathsf{g}^\vee(u)-b_{v,u}\beta_-^\vee(u) & \text{if } u\neq v.\end{cases} \tag{B.7}$$

Remark B.4. If $\mathcal{M}$ is g-*coherent* (that is $\min(\beta_+(u),\beta_-(u))=0$ for all vertices u, or equivalently, $\beta_+=[\mathsf{g}]_+$ and $\beta_-=[-\mathsf{g}]_+$), then (B.6) reads

$$\mathsf{g}'(v):=\begin{cases}-\mathsf{g}(u) & \text{if } u=v;\\ \mathsf{g}(v)+b_{v,u}[\mathsf{g}(u)]_+ & \text{if } b_{v,u}\geq 0;\\ \mathsf{g}(v)+b_{v,u}[-\mathsf{g}(u)]_+ & \text{if } b_{v,u}\leq 0.\end{cases} \tag{B.8}$$

It is known [14] that if $\mathcal{M}$ corresponds to a general presentation, then $\mathsf{g}(\mathcal{M})$ is g-coherent. If $\mathcal{M}$ is obtained from positive simple $(0,S_u)$ via a sequence of mutations, then $\mathcal{M}$ corresponds to an indecomposable rigid presentation. In particular, it is general [10].

B.2. **The Twisted Cyclic Shift via Mutations.** We recall the twisted cyclic shift l on $\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}$ by $(A_1,A_2,A_3^\vee)\mapsto(A_2,A_3\overline{w_0},(A_1\overline{w_0})^\vee)$. To understand this map, we introduce a "half" of this map denoted by $\sqrt{l}$

$$(A_1,A_2,A_3^\vee)\mapsto(A_3,A_1\overline{w_0},A_2^\vee).$$

It is clear that $l=(\sqrt{l})^2$.

Let us recall a sequence of mutations constructed in [25, Section 13]. The sequence is originally defined for the ice quiver Δ_Q in terms of reduced expression of w_0. We now translate it into our setting. Recall that we can label the non-neutral vertices of Δ_Q^2 by a pair (i,t) (before Lemma 6.3). Let

$$t_i:=t^*(\mathrm{O}_i^+)=\max\{t\mid(i,t)\in\Delta_Q^2\}.$$

We first assume that the vertices of Q are ordered such that $i<j$ if $(i,j)\in Q_1$. Then we totally order the mutable vertices of Δ_Q^2 by the relation that $(i,t)<(i',t')$ if $t<t'$, or $t=t'$ and $i<i'$.

Starting from the minimal vertex $(1,1)$ in the ascending order just defined, we perform a sequence of mutations $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{i,t}$ for each (mutable) vertex of Δ_Q^2. For the vertex (i,t), the sequence of mutations is defined to be $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{i,t}:=\mu_{i,t_i-t}\cdots\mu_{i,2}\mu_{i,1}$. So the whole sequence of mutations $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}:=\cdots\boldsymbol{\mu}_{2,1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_{1,1}$.

Let π be the permutation on $(\Delta_Q^2)_0$ defined by

$$(i,t)\mapsto(i,t_i-t)\ \text{ if } (i,t) \text{ is mutable},$$
$$\mathrm{O}_i^-\mapsto\mathrm{Id}_i,\ \mathrm{O}_i^+\mapsto\mathrm{O}_{i^*}^-,\ \mathrm{Id}_i\mapsto\mathrm{O}_i^+\,.$$

It is clear that π is an involution on the set of mutable vertices. When applying it to the quiver Δ_Q^2 or its B-matrix, we view π as a relabelling of the vertices.

For a (trivially valued) Dynkin quiver Q, let Π_Q be its associated *preprojective algebra*. Recall that the module category $\mathrm{mod}\,\Pi_Q$ is a *Frobenius category*. Let $\underline{\mathrm{mod}}\Pi_Q$

be its *stable category*. Recall that such a stable category is naturally triangulated with the shift functor given by the (relative) inverse Syzygy functor Ω^{-1}. Readers can find these standard terminology in, for example, [25]. We will write $\mathrm{Hom}_{\underline{\Pi}_Q}$ for $\mathrm{Hom}_{\underline{\mathrm{mod}}\Pi_Q}$. In [24] the authors defined a tilting module $V := \bigoplus_{u\in(\Delta_Q)_0} V_u$ in $\mathrm{mod}\,\Pi_Q$ (it is denoted by I_Q in [24]). They proved that the quiver of the endomorphism algebra $\mathrm{End}_{\Pi_Q}(V)^{\mathrm{op}}$ is exactly Δ_Q with its frozen vertices of corresponding to the projective-injective objects in $\mathrm{mod}\,\Pi_Q$. Moreover, it is known [4] that the *stable* endomorphism algebra $\mathrm{End}_{\underline{\Pi}_Q}(V)^{\mathrm{op}}$ is the Jacobian algebra J^μ (see Remark 5.3).

For each rigid Π_Q-module M, we can associate a function $\varphi_M \in k[U]$ as in [23]. This function turns out to be a cluster variable for the standard seed $(\Delta_Q, \mathcal{M}_Q)$. In [23] the *mutation of maximal rigid modules* of Π_Q is defined so that it is compatible with the seed mutation. In particular, it is compatible with the quiver mutation, so the quiver of $\mathrm{End}_{\Pi_Q}(\mu_u(V))$ is exactly $\mu_u(\Delta_Q)$.

Proposition B.5. [25, Proposition 13.4] *The sequence of mutations $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}$ takes the modules $V_{\pi(u)}$ to $\Omega^{-1}(V_u)$ for u mutable in Δ_Q.*

Corollary B.6. *Identifying Δ_Q as a subquiver of Δ_Q^2, we have that $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(\Delta_Q)$ and $\pi(\Delta_Q)$ have the same restricted B-matrix.*

Proof. Since Ω is an autoequivalence, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(\Delta_Q)$ and $\pi(\Delta_Q)$ have the same mutable part. Let $\overline{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{i,t} := \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i,t}\cdots\boldsymbol{\mu}_{1,1}$. In [25, Section 13.1], the authors described the each mutated quiver after applying each $\overline{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{i,t}$. It follows easily from their description that after forgetting arrows between frozen vertices, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(\Delta_Q)$ is a subquiver of Δ_Q^2, whose frozen vertex O_i^+ is identified with the frozen vertex O_i^- of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(\Delta_Q)$. □

Let (Δ_Q^μ, W_Q^μ) be the restriction of (Δ_Q, W_Q) to its mutable part. Next, we compute the g-vectors of cluster variables after applying $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}$ to the seed $(\Delta_Q^\mu, \mathbf{x})$. The g-vector of the initial cluster variable $\mathbf{x}_{i,t}$ at the vertex (i,t) is the unit vector $\mathsf{e}_{i,t} \in \mathbb{Z}^{(\Delta_Q^\mu)_0}$. By [13, Theorem 5.2], the g-vector of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(\mathbf{x}_{i,t})$ is nothing but the g-vector of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}^{-1}(0, S_{i,t})$, where $(0, S_{i,t})$ is the positive simple representation of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(\Delta_Q^\mu, W_Q^\mu)$.

Lemma B.7. *We have that $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}^{-1}(\mathsf{e}_{i,t}) = -\mathsf{e}_{i,t_i-t}$ for each $\mathsf{e}_{i,t}$. Here, we view $\mathsf{e}_{i,t}$ as the g-vector of the simple representation $(0, S_{i,t})$ of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(\Delta_Q^\mu, W_Q^\mu)$.*

Proof. It is equivalent to show that $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(-\mathsf{e}_{i,t_i-t}) = \mathsf{e}_{i,t}$. Let $\overline{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{i,t} := \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i,t}\cdots\boldsymbol{\mu}_{1,1}$. We study the mutated g-vector $\overline{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{i,t}(-\mathsf{e}_{i,t_i-t})$ for each (i,t). From the description of mutated quiver $\overline{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{i,t}(\Delta_Q)$ [25, Section 13.1] and the formula (B.8), we find that for $j \neq i$, each $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{j,s}$ does not play any role in $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(-\mathsf{e}_{i,t_i-t})$. In other words, it suffices to compute $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(-\mathsf{e}_{i,t_i-t})$ on the full linear subquiver with vertices (i,t) for $t = 1, \cdots, t_i - 1$. Using the formula (B.8), we can easily prove by induction that

$$\overline{\boldsymbol{\mu}}_{i,s}(-\mathsf{e}_{i,t_i-t}) = \begin{cases} \mathsf{e}_{i,t_i-s} - \mathsf{e}_{i,t_i-s-t} & \text{if } s+t < t_i, \\ \mathsf{e}_{i,t} & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

We conclude from this that $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(-\mathsf{e}_{i,t_i-t}) = \mathsf{e}_{i,t}$. □

Let $\mathbf{g}^{\pi}_{\sqrt{l}}$ be the set of g-vectors given by

$$\mathbf{g}^{\pi}_{\sqrt{l}}(f) = -\mathsf{e}_f + \sum_{i\in Q_0} \Big(\mathsf{e}(f)(i)\mathsf{e}_{\mathrm{O}_i^-} + \mathsf{f}_+(i)\mathsf{e}_{\mathrm{O}_i^+} + \mathsf{f}_-(i)\mathsf{e}_{\mathrm{Id}_i}\Big). \tag{B.9}$$

Let $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\pi}_{\sqrt{l}}$ be the weight configuration defined by

$$\boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\pi}_{\sqrt{l}}(f) = (\mathsf{f}_+, \mathsf{e}(f)^*, \mathsf{f}_-),$$

where $\mathsf{f} \mapsto \mathsf{f}^*$ is the involution on $\mathbb{Z}^{Q_0}$ induced by $\mathsf{e}_i \mapsto \mathsf{e}_{i^*}$, so $-w_0(\varpi(\mathsf{f})) = \varpi(\mathsf{f}^*)$.

Corollary B.8. *For any f mutable, we have that $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{-1}_{\sqrt{l}}(\mathsf{e}_f) = \mathbf{g}^{\pi}_{\sqrt{l}}(\pi(f))$. Here, we view e_f as the g-vector of the simple representation $(0, S_f)$ of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(\Delta^2_Q, W^2_Q)$. So $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2_Q)(f) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\pi}_{\sqrt{l}}(\pi(f))$.*

Proof. In Lemma B.7 we have obtained the principal part of $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{-1}_{\sqrt{l}}(\mathsf{e}_f)$, which is $-\mathsf{e}_{\pi(f)}$. Now we are going to recover its extended part from its principal part.

We recall from [14, Proposition 5.15] that being μ-supported for a g-vector is mutation invariant. The general presentation with g-vector equal to $-\mathsf{e}_f$ corresponds to the indecomposable projective representation $\boldsymbol{P}_f$. By Lemma 5.2 $\boldsymbol{P}_f(\mathrm{O}_i^+) \cong \mathrm{Hom}_Q(P_+, P_i)$. So to make the g-vector $-\mathsf{e}_f$ not supported on O_i^+, we must add at least $\mathsf{f}_+(i)\mathsf{e}_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}$ to it. Similarly we must add at least $\mathsf{f}_-(i)\mathsf{e}_{\mathrm{Id}_i}$ and $\mathsf{e}(f)(i)\mathsf{e}_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}$ as well. On the other hand, it is easy to check that (B.9) is μ-supported. So adding any additional positive component on the frozen vertices will make the general presentation of this g-vector decomposable, which is not the case. Hence, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(\mathsf{e}_f) = \mathbf{g}^{\pi}_{\sqrt{l}}(\pi(f))$.

For the last statement, recall that $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2_Q(f) = (\mathsf{e}(f), \mathsf{f}_-, \mathsf{f}_+)$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{g}^{\pi}_{\sqrt{l}}(f)\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2_Q &= -(\mathsf{e}(f), \mathsf{f}_-, \mathsf{f}_+) + (\mathsf{e}(f), \mathsf{e}(f)^*, 0) + (\mathsf{f}_+, 0, \mathsf{f}_+) + (0, \mathsf{f}_-, \mathsf{f}_-)\\ &= (\mathsf{f}_+, \mathsf{e}(f)^*, \mathsf{f}_-).\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Hence,}\quad \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2_Q)(f) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(\mathsf{e}_f)\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2_Q = \mathbf{g}^{\pi}_{\sqrt{l}}(\pi(f))\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2_Q = \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\pi}_{\sqrt{l}}(\pi(f)).$$

□

Corollary B.9. *$\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(\Delta^2_Q)$ and $\pi(\Delta^2_Q)$ have the same restricted B-matrix.*

Proof. By Corollary B.6, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(\Delta^2_Q)$ and $\pi(\Delta^2_Q)$ have the same mutable part as well. It remains to show that the blocks of their restricted B-matrices corresponding to positive and neutral frozen vertices are equal. But this follows from an easy linear algebra consideration. Indeed, let $B^2_{\sqrt{l}}$ and $B_{\sqrt{l}}$ be the restricted B-matrices of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(\Delta^2_Q)$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(\Delta_Q)$ and denote $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2_{\sqrt{l}} := \boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2_Q)$. We have that $B^2_{\sqrt{l}}\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2_{\sqrt{l}} = 0$. We write $B^2_{\sqrt{l}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}^2_{\sqrt{l}}$ in blocks: $(B_{\sqrt{l}}, C_{\sqrt{l}})$ and $\left(\begin{smallmatrix}\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\sqrt{l}}\\ \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{+,\mathrm{Id}}\end{smallmatrix}\right)$, where $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{+,\mathrm{Id}} = \left(\begin{smallmatrix}I & 0 & I\\ 0 & I & I\end{smallmatrix}\right)$ contains weights corresponding to the positive and neutral frozen vertices. We have that

$$(B_{\sqrt{l}}, C_{\sqrt{l}})\left(\begin{smallmatrix}\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\sqrt{l}}\\ \boldsymbol{\sigma}_{+,\mathrm{Id}}\end{smallmatrix}\right) = B_{\sqrt{l}}\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\sqrt{l}} + C_{\sqrt{l}}\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{+,\mathrm{Id}} = 0. \tag{B.10}$$

Since $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{+,\mathrm{Id}}$ is of full rank, this linear equation is overdetermined (for solving $C_{\sqrt{l}}$). We have seen that $B_{\sqrt{l}} = B_{\pi(\Delta_Q)}$ and $\boldsymbol{\sigma}_{\sqrt{l}}(f) = \boldsymbol{\sigma}^{\pi}_{\sqrt{l}}(\pi(f))$, then it is clear that $C_{\sqrt{l}} = \pi(C)$ satisfies (B.10), where C is the block in $B_{\Delta^2_Q} = (B_{\Delta_Q}, C)$. □

Definition B.10. Let $\boldsymbol{\mu}^{\pi}_{\sqrt{l}} := \pi^{-1}\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}\pi$. We define $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l := \boldsymbol{\mu}^{\pi}_{\sqrt{l}}\boldsymbol{\mu}_{\sqrt{l}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_r = \boldsymbol{\mu}_l^2$.

Corollary B.11. *$\boldsymbol{\mu}_l(\Delta_Q^2)$ and $\pi^2(\Delta_Q^2)$ have the same restricted B-matrix. Moreover, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_Q^2)(f) = (\mathsf{f}_-, \mathsf{f}_+^*, \mathsf{e}(f)^*)$ for f mutable.*

Note that π^2 fixes the mutable vertices and shuffles the frozen vertices of Δ_Q^2

$$\mathrm{O}_i^- \mapsto \mathrm{O}_i^+,\ \mathrm{O}_i^+ \mapsto \mathrm{Id}_{i^*},\ \mathrm{Id}_i \mapsto \mathrm{O}_i^- .$$

Corollary B.12. *We have that $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l^3(B_{\Delta_Q^2}, \mathbf{x}) = (B_{\Delta_Q^2}, \mathbf{x})$.*

Proof. Since $\pi^6 = \mathrm{Id}$, the fact that $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l^3(B_{\Delta_Q^2}) = B_{\Delta_Q^2}$ follows from Corollary B.11. As pointed in [24], it is well-known [1] that the functor Ω is also 6-periodic. [26, Proposition 6.3] says that the mutation of maximal rigid modules of Π_Q is compatible with the mutation of the corresponding QP-representations (see remarks before Proposition B.5). So by Proposition B.5 the positive simples $(0, S_f)$ of (Δ_Q, W_Q) are invariant under $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l^3$. The invariance obviously extends to (Δ_Q^2, W_Q^2). The desired result follows. □

By experiment with [29] we believe the following conjecture.

Conjecture B.13. Corollary B.9 (and thus Corollary B.11, B.12 and Theorem B.14 below) hold for non-trivially valued Q as well.

We define a rational self-map μ_l of $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_Q^2, \mathcal{S}_Q^2)$ induced by

$$\begin{cases} s_f \mapsto \boldsymbol{\mu}_l(s_f) & \text{if } f \text{ is mutable,} \\ s_{\mathrm{O}_i^-} \mapsto s_{\mathrm{O}_i^+},\ s_{\mathrm{O}_i^+} \mapsto s_{\mathrm{Id}_{i^*}},\ s_{\mathrm{Id}_i} \mapsto s_{\mathrm{O}_{i^*}^-}. \end{cases}$$

Since our main theorem (Theorem 9.1) use the following theorem, we cannot assume that $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_Q^2, \mathcal{S}_Q^2) = k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}]$. But from the proof of Theorem 9.1, we have that $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_Q^2, \mathcal{S}_Q^2) \subseteq k[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}]$. So the pullback l^* is defined on $\overline{\mathcal{C}}(\Delta_Q^2, \mathcal{S}_Q^2)$. It is easy to see that s_f is in fact in $\mathbb{Q}[\mathrm{Conf}_{2,1}]$, so the containment holds over $\mathbb{Q}$. Moreover, $\overline{\mathcal{C}}_k(\Delta_Q^2, \mathcal{S}_Q^2)$ can be obtained from the base change $k \otimes_{\mathbb{Q}} \overline{\mathcal{C}}_{\mathbb{Q}}(\Delta_Q^2, \mathcal{S}_Q^2)$. The cluster mutation and twisted cyclic shift are clearly defined over $\mathbb{Q}$ as well.

Theorem B.14. *The map μ_l is equal to the pullback l^* of the twisted cyclic shift.*

Proof. We need to show that $\mu_l(\varphi) = \varphi l$. It suffices to prove the statement for φ's in some extended cluster because of the definition of the upper cluster algebra. The cluster we shall take is $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l^2(\mathcal{S}_Q^2)$, which is the same as $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l^{-1}(\mathcal{S}_Q^2)$ by Corollary B.12. The statement is clearly true for the coefficient variables. So let us assume that $\varphi = \boldsymbol{\mu}_l^2(s_f)$ for some mutable $f \in \mathrm{ind}(C^2Q)$.

We need to show that $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l(\varphi)(A_1, A_2, A_3^\vee) = \varphi(A_2, A_3\overline{w_0}, (A_1\overline{w_0})^\vee)$. We argue by multidegrees. By Corollary B.11, the degree of φ is $(\mathsf{f}_+^*, \mathsf{e}(f), \mathsf{f}_-^*)$. Then according to (6.1) and (6.2), the degree of $\varphi(A_2, A_3\overline{w_0}, (A_1\overline{w_0})^\vee)$ is $(\mathsf{e}(f), \mathsf{f}_-, \mathsf{f}_+)$, which is also the degree of $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l(\varphi) = s_f$. So by Lemma 8.3, we must have that $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l(\varphi) = c\varphi l$ for some $c \in k$.

To show $c = 1$, we can consider the relevant constructions over $\mathbb{Q}$ by the above remark. We note that $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l$ clearly commutes with l so

$$\varphi = \boldsymbol{\mu}_l^2\boldsymbol{\mu}_l(\varphi) = \boldsymbol{\mu}_l^2(c\varphi l) = c\boldsymbol{\mu}_l^2(\varphi)l = c^2\boldsymbol{\mu}_l(\varphi l^2) = c^3\varphi l^3 = c^3\varphi.$$

We must have that $c = 1$. □

B.3. **An Algorithm.** In this section, we present an algorithm to find all subrepresentations of T_v defined in Section 5.1. As said in the introduction, only few T_v's for type E_7 and E_8 need this algorithm. With a little more effort, one can show that Corollary B.11 can be strengthened to $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l(\Delta_Q^2) = \pi^2(\Delta_Q^2)$ for any orientation of type D_n and E_7, E_8, and for some orientations of type A_n and E_6. For any particular case whether $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l(\Delta_Q^2) = \pi^2(\Delta_Q^2)$ holds can be checked by computer.

We first observe that by the description of T_v's in Theorem 5.4, all subrepresentations of $T_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}$ are known. In particular, we have the dual F-polynomial of $T_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}$. Even better, $T_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}$ can be mutated from the positive simple $(0, S_{\mathrm{O}_i^-})$ of the (unfrozen) QP $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i\left(\Delta(C^2Q), W_Q^2\right)$ via $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i^{-1}$, where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_i := \boldsymbol{\mu}_{i,0}\mu_{i,0}$ and the bold $\boldsymbol{\mu}_{i,0}$ is defined in the beginning of Appendix B.2. Indeed, it can be easily checked by (B.7) that the $\mathsf{g}^\vee$-vector of such a mutated representation is exactly $\mathsf{e}_{\mathrm{O}_i^-} - \sum_{i\to j}\mathsf{e}_{\mathrm{O}_j^-}$. Since $T_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}$ is the cokernel of a general presentation of such a weight, our claim follows from Remark B.4. The idea of the algorithm is that we can generate the dual F-polynomial of $T_{\mathrm{Id}_{i^*}}$ (resp. $T_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}$) from that of $T_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}$ through the sequence of mutations $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{\mu}_r$) just defined.

Proposition B.15. *If $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l(\Delta_Q^2) = \pi^2(\Delta_Q^2)$, then $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l(T_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}) = T_{\mathrm{Id}_{i^*}}$ and $\boldsymbol{\mu}_r(T_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}) = T_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}$. Here, we view $T_{\mathrm{Id}_{i^*}}$ and $T_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}$ as representations of the original QP via the automorphisms π^{-2} and π^2.*

Proof. It is clear from (B.7) that the $\mathsf{g}^\vee$-vector $\mathsf{e}_{\mathrm{O}_i^-} - \sum_{i\to j}\mathsf{e}_{\mathrm{O}_j^-}$ is unchanged under $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l$. If $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l(\Delta_Q^2) = \pi^2(\Delta_Q^2)$, by Corollary B.11 the mutated $\mathsf{g}^\vee$-vector can be view as $\mathsf{e}_{\mathrm{Id}_{i^*}} - \sum_{i\to j}\mathsf{e}_{\mathrm{Id}_{j^*}}$ for the original QP (Δ_Q^2, W_Q^2) via the automorphism π^{-2}. Note that $i \to j$ if and only if $i^* \to j^*$. Clearly $T_{\mathrm{Id}_{i^*}}$ is the cokernel of the general presentation of weight $\mathsf{e}_{\mathrm{Id}_{i^*}} - \sum_{i^*\to j^*}\mathsf{e}_{\mathrm{Id}_j^*}$. Hence, $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l(T_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}) = T_{\mathrm{Id}_{i^*}}$. The argument for $\boldsymbol{\mu}_r(T_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}) = T_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}$ is similar. □

So we can compute $F^\vee_{T_{\mathrm{Id}_{i^*}}}$ (resp. $F^\vee_{T_{\mathrm{O}_i^+}}$) by applying $\boldsymbol{\mu}_l$ (resp. $\boldsymbol{\mu}_r$) to $F^\vee_{T_{\mathrm{O}_i^-}}$ using the formula (B.5). In this way, we find all subrepresentations of T_v's.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank Professor Bernard Leclerc for some interesting discussion during the Taipei Conference in Representation Theory Jan 2016.

References

1. M. Auslander, I. Reiten, *$D\,\mathrm{Tr}$-periodic modules and functors, Representation theory of algebras,* (Cocoyoc, 1994), CMS Conf. Proc., vol. 18, Amer. Math. Soc., Providence, RI, 1996, pp. 39–50.
2. M. Auslander, I. Reiten, S. O. Smalø, *Representation theory of Artin algebras,* Corrected reprint of the 1995 original. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics, 36. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997.
3. I. Assem, D. Simson, A. Skowroński, *Elements of the Representation Theory of Associative Algebras,* London Mathematical Society Student Texts 65, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
4. A. Buan, O. Iyama, I. Reiten, D. Smith, *Mutation of cluster-tilting objects and potentials,* Amer. J. Math. 133 no.4 (2011) 835–887.
5. A. Berenstein, A. Zelevinsky, *Triple multiplicities for $sl(r+1)$ and the spectrum of the exterior algebra of the adjoint representation,* J. Alg. Comb., 1 (1992), 7–22.
6. A. Berenstein, A. Zelevinsky, *Tensor product multiplicities, canonical bases and totally positive varieties,* Invent. Math. 143 (2001), 77–128.

7. A. Berenstein, S. Fomin, A. Zelevinsky, *Cluster algebras. III. Upper bounds and double Bruhat cells,* Duke Math. J. 126 (2005), no. 1, 1–52.
8. G. I. Cerulli, E. Feigin, M. Reineke, *Desingularization of quiver Grassmannians for Dynkin quivers,* Adv. Math. 245 (2013), 182–207.
9. V. Dlab, C. M. Ringel, *Indecomposable representations of graphs and algebras,* Mem. Amer. Math. Soc. 6 (1976), no. 173, v+57.
10. H. Derksen, J. Fei, *General presentations of algebras,* Adv. Math. 278 (2015), 210–237.
11. H. Derksen, J. Weyman, *Semi-invariants of quivers and saturation for Littlewood-Richardson coefficients,* J. Amer. Math. Soc. 13 (2000), no. 3, 467–479.
12. H. Derksen, J. Weyman, A. Zelevinsky, *Quivers with potentials and their representations I,* Selecta Math. (N.S.) 14 (2008), no. 1, 59–119.
13. H. Derksen, J. Weyman, A. Zelevinsky, *Quivers with potentials and their representations II,* J. Amer. Math. Soc. 23 (2010), no. 3, 749–790.
14. J. Fei, *Cluster algebras and semi-invariant rings I. Triple Flags,* arXiv:1411.4693.
15. J. Fei, *Cluster algebras and semi-invariant rings II. Projections,* arXiv:1508.05563.
16. J. Fei, *Cluster Algebras, Invariant Theory, and Kronecker Coefficients I,* arXiv:1504.02970.
17. V. Fock, A. Goncharov, *Moduli spaces of local systems and higher Teichmüller theory,* Publ. Math. Inst. Hautes Études Sci., 103 (2006) 1–211.
18. V. Fock, A. Goncharov, *Cluster ensembles, quantization and the dilogarithm,* Ann. Sci. Éc. Norm. Supér. (4) 42 (2009), no. 6, 865–930.
19. S. Fomin, P. Pylyavskyy, *Tensor diagrams and cluster algebras,* arXiv:1210.1888.
20. S. Fomin, A. Zelevinsky, *Double Bruhat cells and total positivity,* J. Amer. Math. Soc. 12 (1999), no. 2, 335–380.
21. S. Fomin, A. Zelevinsky, *Cluster algebras. I. Foundations,* J. Amer. Math. Soc. 15 (2002), no. 2, 497–529.
22. S. Fomin, A. Zelevinsky, *Cluster algebras. IV. Coefficients,* Compos. Math. 143 (2007), no. 1, 112–164.
23. C. Geiss, B. Leclerc, J. Schröer, *Rigid modules over preprojective algebras,* Invent. Math. 165 (2006), 589–632.
24. C. Geiss, B. Leclerc, J. Schröer, *Auslander algebras and initial seeds for cluster,* Journal of the London Mathematical Society (2) 75 (2007), 718–740.
25. C. Geiss, B. Leclerc, J. Schröer, *Kac-Moody groups and cluster algebras,* Adv. Math. 228 (2011), no. 1, 329–433.
26. C. Geiss, B. Leclerc, J. Schröer, *Generic bases for cluster algebras and the Chamber ansatz,* J. Amer. Math. Soc. 25 (2012), no. 1, 21–76.
27. A. Goncharov, L. Shen, *Geometry of canonical bases and mirror symmetry,* Invent. Math. 202 (2015), no. 2, 487–633.
28. R. Goodman, N. R. Wallach, *Symmetry, representations, and invariants,* Graduate Texts in Mathematics, 255. Springer, Dordrecht, 2009.
29. B. Keller, Quiver mutation in Java, http://www.math.jussieu.fr/~keller/quivermutation/.
30. B. Kostant, *A formula for the multiplicity of a weight,* Trans. Amer. Math. Soc., 93, (1959), No. 1, 53–73.
31. F. Knop, H. Kraft, T. Vust, *The Picard group of a G-variety. Algebraische Transformationsgruppen und Invariantentheorie, 77–87,* DMV Sem., 13, Birkhäuser, Basel, 1989.
32. A. Knutson, T. Tao, *The honeycomb model of* $\mathrm{GL}_n(\mathbb{C})$ *tensor products. I. Proof of the saturation conjecture,* J. Amer. Math. Soc. 12 (1999), no. 4, 1055–1090.
33. M. A. A. van Leeuwen, A. M. Cohen, B. Lisser, "LiE, a package for Lie group computations", http://www-math.univ-poitiers.fr/~maavl/LiE/.
34. D. Labardini-Fragoso, A. Zelevinsky, *Strongly primitive species with potentials I: mutations,* Boletn de la Sociedad Matemtica Mexicana, 1–69.
35. P. Littelmann, *A Littlewood-Richardson rule for symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebras,* Invent. math. 116 (1994), 329–346.
36. G. Lusztig, *Canonical basis arising from quantum canonical algebras,* J. Amer. Math. Soc. 3, (1990) no 2, 447–498.
37. P. Plamondon, *Generic bases for cluster algebras from the cluster category,* Int. Math. Res. Notices (2013) 2013 (10): 2368–2420.
38. V. L. Popov, E. B. Vinberg, *Invariant theory, in: Algebraic geometry. IV, Encyclopaedia of Mathematical Sciences,* vol. 55, Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994, 123–284.

39. B. Shapiro, M. Shapiro, A. Vainshtein, A. Zelevinsky, *Simply-laced Coxeter groups and groups generated by symplectic transvections,* Michigan Math. J. 48 (2000), 531–551.
40. A. Zelevinsky, *From Littlewood-Richardson coefficients to cluster algebras in three lectures,* Symmetric functions 2001: surveys of developments and perspectives, 253–273, NATO Sci. Ser. II Math. Phys. Chem., 74, Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 2002.

National Center for Theoretical Sciences, Taipei 10617, Taiwan
E-mail address: jrfei@ncts.ntu.edu.tw